Lilies

LIBRARY
OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA.
GIFT OF
Mrs. SARAH P. WALSWORTH.
Received October, 1894.
Accessions No. 57095. *Class No.* 35 V
S855
v.5-6

E. B. Walsworth
Manville

THE

WORDS OF THE LORD JESUS.

BY

RUDOLF STIER,

DOCTOR OF THEOLOGY, CHIEF PASTOR AND SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHKEUDITZ.

VOLUME FIFTH.

TRANSLATED FROM THE SECOND REVISED AND ENLARGED GERMAN EDITION,

BY THE

REV. WILLIAM B. POPE.

NEW EDITION.

PHILADELPHIA:
SMITH, ENGLISH, AND CO.
NEW YORK: SHELDON, & CO. BOSTON: GOULD & LINCOLN.

MDCCCLX. 1860

LIBRARY OF THE

BS2370
S8
v. 5-6

57095

Prov xxx. 3–6.

וְלֹא לָמַדְתִּי חָכְמָה וְדַעַת קְדֹשִׁים אֵדָע׃ מִי עָלָה־שָׁמַיִם וַיֵּרֶד מִי אָסַף־רוּחַ בְּחָפְנָיו
מִי צָרַר־מַיִם בַּשִּׂמְלָה מִי הֵקִים כָּל־אַפְסֵי־אָרֶץ מַה־שְּׁמוֹ וּמַה־שֵּׁם־בְּנוֹ כִּי תֵדָע׃
כָּל־אִמְרַת אֱלוֹהַּ צְרוּפָה מָגֵן הוּא לַחֹסִים בּוֹ׃ אַל־תּוֹסֵף עַל־דְּבָרָיו פֶּן־יוֹכִיחַ בְּךָ
וְנִכְזָבְתָּ׃

John iii. 10, 11.

Σὺ εἶ ὁ διδάσκαλος τοῦ Ἰσραήλ, καὶ ταῦτα οὐ γινώσκεις; Ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω σοι, ὅτι ὃ οἴδαμεν λαλοῦμεν, καὶ ὃ ἑωράκαμεν μαρτυροῦμεν· καὶ τὴν μαρτυρίαν ἡμῶν οὐ λαμβάνετε.

PREFATORY NOTICE.

THE Translator must once more remind his readers that he is not responsible for the opinions of his author. There will be found in the present volume, as in the last, passages (in his judgment) either erroneous or of erroneous tendency: such, for instance, as the germs of speculation about the intermediate state which are to be detected in the exposition of Lu. xvi., and the sacramental theories deduced from the third and sixth chapters of St John. It is sufficient to say that the author is a Lutheran divine, and vindicates on all occasions the higher ecclesiastical views of his communion; but this does not, in the Translator's judgment, impair the value of the work, as a whole, to the thoughtful and catholic reader who keeps that fact always in view.

For himself he may add, that while it would have been much more satisfactory to his own mind to send forth his labours without any such caution, the profound study of our Lord's words which such a translation requires and assists, has been to him a blessing for which he is deeply thankful.

HULL, 1856.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME FIFTH.

THE GOSPEL OF ST JOHN.

Page

Conversation with the Woman of Samaria. The Water of Life: Worship in Spirit and Truth: the Messiah Come, ch. iv. 7–26, . . 1

Enigmatical Words to the Apostles. The Higher Food: the Sower's Labour for the Reapers sent forth, and their Joy together, ch. iv. 32–38, ... 50

The Two Sayings to the Nobleman. The Desire for Signs and Wonders Blamed: Assurance, nevertheless, of the Miracle Wrought, ch. iv. 48–50, ... 66

The Three Sayings to the Impotent Man at Bethesda: Awakening, Help, Warning, ch. v. 6, 8, 14, ... 74

Testimony to the Jews: Concerning the Operation of the Son, in the Unity of the Father; in Quickening and in Judgment; the Punishment of Unbelief in the Father's Testimony; Appeal to the Scriptures and Moses, ch. v. 17, 19–47, ... 83

Testimony to the People after the Miraculous Feeding. Jesus hath the Bread of Life; the Eating and Drinking His Flesh and His Blood, ch. vi. 26–58, ... 149

Appeal to the Offended Disciples for Test and Decision. The Ascension of the Son of Man. Spirit and Life, ch. vi. 61–65, . . . 205

Appeal to the Twelve. Will ye also? One of you is —! ch. vi. 67–70, 225

To His Unbelieving Brethren: My time and My way are not Yours, ch. vii. 6–8, ... 233

At the Feast of Tabernacles; *First* great Conversation with the Jews. My Doctrine is from God: Circumcision and Healing on the Sabbath: Ye know Whence I am! ch. vii. 16–29, ... 243

Further Warning to Unbelievers. Yet a Little While am I with You! ch. vii. 33, 34, ... 270

Invitation to Believers. Promise of the Streams of Living Water, ch. vii. 37, 38, ... 276

Decision on the Adulteress, ch. viii. 7, 10, 11, ... 293

Page

Shorter Conversation ensuing: Jesus the Light of the World: His valid Witness to Himself, ch. viii. 12–19, ... 314

Final and Conflicting Conversation: the Dying in their Sins; Belief that I am He; True Freedom; the Children of Abraham and the Children of the Devil; Christ before Abraham, ch. viii. 21–58, . . 330

The Man born Blind. Answer on the Cause of the Evil; Working before the Night Cometh; the Sending to the Pool of Siloam; His Manifestation as the Son of God, ch. ix. 3–7, 35–37, . . 421

Last Public Testimony of Jesus concerning His Person and Work: Those who See by Faith, and the Blind through Unbelief; the Hirelings and the True Shepherd, ch. ix. 39–x. 18, ... 448

At the Feast of Dedication: Explanation and Expansion of the Last Testimony. I and My Father are one! ch. x. 25–30, . . 484

Assertion of this Last Saying against Contradiction: the Many Good Works: the "gods" and the *Son* of God, ch. x. 32–38, . . 494

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA.

THE GOSPEL OF ST JOHN.

CONVERSATION WITH THE WOMAN OF SAMARIA; THE WATER OF LIFE; WORSHIP IN SPIRIT AND TRUTH; THE MESSIAH COME.

(Ch. iv. 7–26.)

IMMEDIATELY after his prologue, the Evangelist gave, first of all, the witness of John the Baptist; then followed the commencement of the revelation of Jesus on the reception of His first disciples; then the manifestation of His glory in its grace at Cana, and in its severity of truth at Jerusalem, in mutually supplementing contrast. He then introduces *two testimonies of Jesus concerning Himself*, similarly connected together, in which He committed Himself to two very different persons—Nicodemus and the woman of Samaria. The introduction to these is found in chap. ii. 23–25, by way of antithesis. He did not commit Himself to these, but to others He did, as He knew what was in them:—to Nicodemus, a ruler of Jerusalem, the only one of his order till now; to the Samaritan woman, who had many like herself.

Before, however, the *counterpart* to Nicodemus is entered upon, the Evangelist inserts a supplementary illustration of the relation of Jesus to the Baptist, in a *final* testimony of the latter, which remarkably accords with the testimony given to Nicodemus.[1] The literal expressions may in individual cases have

[1] We prefer this distribution to Luthardt's threefold arrangement (Lut. i. 271). The scheme which he has drawn out at such length does not exclude other views of the order of the discourse.

been here and there departed from,[1] but as a whole we have the authentic words of the Baptist from the 27th verse to the end of the chapter. As Jesus, before His redeeming death, was a prophet for Himself, so did He connect His own ministry with the function of the Baptist which closed all prophecy; but he baptizes only through His disciples, the least in the kingdom of heaven being greater than the greatest without. Thus do the preparation for Jesus, and His actual coming, continue to run side by side, even after He had actually come. The Baptist's position was acknowledged by Jesus Himself, and gives a key to the history of His church. Generally speaking, chaps. ii.–v. of St John's Gospel contain the record of the *transition time*, in which Jesus in conjunction with John, in part baptizes, in part already bears witness like him. He does not as yet preach; that commenced only when John retired.

What follows ver. 31 in the third chapter is clearly a continuation of the former discourse. The Baptist testified in the first part—I, who must decrease, have, as man, my measure and degree. In the second, he continues—But He, as the Son of God, receives everything without measure, *takes* nothing from heaven, is Himself come down from above! Thus it was very necessary, not only that John should send away men from himself, but that he should strongly affirm the dignity of Him who had been misunderstood, and point all men to Him. He now knew full well all that he witnessed: he knew Him as the *Lamb*, and as the *Bridegroom*,[2] and, indeed, since the revelation at the baptism, as the *Son of God*, chap. i. 34. What he adds, ver. 34–36, was received at that revelation, to which the δεδομένον of ver. 27 already alluded. The "phraseology" about which the learned have so many objections, is first that of the *Spirit* and the matter itself, and only thus the Evangelist's. The *names* of Christ sig-

[1] We should not, however, dare to translate back again from the Evangelist's into the Baptist's manner of speaking, as Ebrard does, p. 335. Comp. Luthardt i. 173, etc., who sees, with myself, only a faint trace of the subjectivity of the Evangelist in the *expression* given to the Baptist's thoughts.

[2] Luthardt's coincidence "Baptistæ verba in memoriam nobis revocant nuptias Canenses" (De Compos. p. 27), we must leave undetermined; especially as the Baptist certainly had Scriptural authority for his representation.

nificantly advance in dignity, in contrast with the ἄνθρωπος with which the whole began. In ver. 8 ὁ Χριστός, but still a man, to whom God giveth the Spirit; in ver. 29, the νυμφίος who will unite Himself with us; in ver. 31, the ἄνωθεν, ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἐρχομενος, and in ver. 34, ὃν ἀπέστειλεν ὁ θεός in an eminent and special sense, down from and out from Himself;—then in ver. 35, the *Son* of God. He who receives this testimony sets to his seal, that God is true; as he himself receives the seal and assurance of this, so is he a seal also to others. (2 Cor. iii. 2, 3.) The Baptist, and every one who stood without with him, could not give the epistle and seal of the Spirit: it was for them to appeal to another—He will bring it! All the prophets spoke upon earth with their expectant eyes fixed upon heaven; he that believeth on Him who came down from heaven, hath the witness of God in himself, as the seal of the fulfilment of all, and can consequently give testimony to others from this inward experience. (Comp. 1 Cor. ix. 2.) The Son indeed *speaketh* ἐν ὁμοιώματι of men and prophets (ver. 34), but His λαλεῖν alone is, at the same time, a perfect μαρτυρεῖν in the highest sense. He does not speak merely ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ, but τὰ ῥήματα τοῦ θεοῦ; that is, the Son speaketh all the words which the Godhead hath for us (ch. i. 18).[1] Thus hath the Father given all things into His hand, who is ever ἐπάνω πάντων: this being neuter in ver. 31, as the concrete idea of οὐρανός, מָרוֹם. In that the Father giveth His beloved Son to us, He gives His Fatherly love to the Son also to us. Christ is the redeeming arm of God's power, but also the bestowing hand of God's love; He is Himself both gift and Giver to *faith*. Hence faith or unbelief towards Him decides for life or death. It is with this final word of promise and word of terror from the Old Testament, that John, as Lange says (iii. 578), closes his prophetic function to bear testimony to Christ.

The Lord now bears the same witness to the unlearned woman at Sychar, which he had borne to the Master in Israel: the same to the ignorant schismatic and sinner, as to the sanctified Pharisee. The object of His testimony is to reveal Himself as

[1] The same was signified of old in Deut. xviii. 18, 19; in the pre-eminent sense of a final, most special fulfilment.

the gift of God (or the medium and giver of that gift). The great theme is—*the gift of God*, ch. iii. 16. More particularly the true gift of God is this, that I, as the Messiah now come, give to all who ask it the true water of life, in order to bring in the time of the worship of the Father in spirit and in truth.

The conversation divides itself into *two main parts:* one more general, and one more particular. The *more general* portion is *preparatory and figurative:* the *more special* is then *drawn out in detail* and in *plain* expressions. The former sets out with the paradoxical and awakening testimony:—*There is* a water of life! and this is the true gift of God through Me! We must observe here the point of connection, and the transition. The *connection* is with the present, earthly gift of God, the water which supplies the figure. Ver. 7. (First turning-point:—the woman becomes attentive to the speaker, and enters into conversation with Him.) Then follows the transition to the true or spiritual gift of God—the same in its source, contrasted in its worth: not without allusion to the end of the whole colloquy—*He Himself who was speaking!* (Second turning-point: the woman does not understand, and opposes.) Then follows a *plain designation*, though as yet in figurative, preparatory words, of the spiritual gift; and its worth is shown in relation to the permanence of its satisfaction, vers. 13, 14. There is first another antithesis—He who drinketh *this* water shall never thirst: then comes the plain declaration—*Springing up* into everlasting life! (Third turning-point: the woman *begins to understand*, but her notion being obscure, she can only speak *evasively*.)

The Lord now commences the second part of His discourse; speaks plainly to her and without figure, though only pursuing into detail what the former part had prepared for. *Salvation* cometh to sinners *by Me*, the Messiah of the Jews, whose design is to establish the universal worship of the Father in spirit and in truth. Here, again, there is first the evidence of her own need, which is brought home personally to her conscience, and admits no evasion; and then the most plain and ample exhibition and offer of the gift of God. The woman is at once apprehended, by the bringing to her conscience of her present *sin*, ver. 16. (Fourth turning-point:—she is more keenly smitten, and already makes a half-confession.) Her confession is with

gracious severity dwelt upon, and the sin of the whole life made manifest to her by its last sin, vers. 17, 18. (Fifth turning-point: —she silently confesses; discerns, finally, *the Prophet;* and then, after her own manner, asks concerning true worship.)

Now, finally, comes the explicit and full offer! First, as necessarily opposing the error of the questioner—the one great end of the great Future now beginning (ver. 21), and the original point of difference in the present relations of Jews and Samaritans (ver. 22). Hereupon is indicated and offered us the gift of Jesus—*the Spirit* given in order to the true worship of the Father—*this* is the water of life: the *Messiah* (the Son of the Father, though the Samaritan woman knew not this as yet), who brings and imparts that Spirit, is—*Myself!* The necessity wherefore only such are the true worshippers whom the Father seeketh to worship Him, ver. 23. Its *ground* in the *nature of God*, with at the same time an intimation that that Spirit can be a *gift from God alone*, ver. 24. (The sixth critical moment in the colloquy:—the woman thinks now of the promised Giver and Mediator of this gift—almost regards Jesus as being He.) The Lord then concludes with a seventh saying, returning back to the first:—Now recognise the gift of God, know who it is that speaketh with thee, that thou mayest make thy petition to Him —'Εγώ εἰμι! ver. 26.[1]

Before we enter upon the detailed exposition of this most mar-

[1] In the first collection of my "Andeutungen" I showed how in this most distinctly historical presentation the process of conversion in many souls is reflected; and may repeat it from a work now laid aside. First, there is imparted an obscure, indefinite, and general knowledge of the need of sustenance for the *soul.* This is at first a figure, in the beginning not understood; then are we constrained to mark it well, but will not. God comes closer and more keenly with the discovery of personal sin: then follows the half-denial, yet half-submission to the authority of God's omniscience; and, finally, repentance! Now comes the inquiry for the true service of God, confused as we are concerning it by the tradition of vain "worship" from our fathers. Then follows the right understanding of worship in spirit and in truth, with earnest desire after Him who brings light and power required in order to offer it. He now places Himself openly before us, the pitcher of earthly pleasure is left standing, and we go at once to magnify the great Giver to our brethren.

vellous conversation,[1] thus preparatorily sketched, we must spend a glance upon its scene, as the Evangelist, vers. 1–6, exhibits it to us. After the parenthesis of John's words, he takes up the thread of ver. 26 again. He himself terms Jesus *the Lord* (here for the first time, when he is retreating before the Pharisees!) and then introduces, with the names *Jesus* and *John*, what the Pharisees had heard. The more gracious of these two was the more attractive to the people; and, besides this, John with constant earnestness directed all to *Him:* hence naturally the concourse around Him, in which, however, according to chap. iii. 32, there was but little true faith exhibited. To the Pharisees, on the contrary, the legal John was more acceptable or more tolerable: their enmity began to rage against the Lord, who penetrates, and perceives it without being informed concerning it in any human way. (The ἔγνω rises somewhat above the ἤκουσαν.) In connection with the baptizing, the Evangelist interposes the important circumstance that Jesus did not Himself baptize,[2]—and this, as being a manifold presumption of common people, provoked the Pharisees still more. Suffice it that the Lord, avoiding these Pharisees, left Judæa, and turned towards the chosen and predicted sphere of His main activity, towards the more susceptible *Galilee*. He went naturally by the shortest way, for it would have been a sanction of Pharisaism in Him to have avoided the Samaritans, which only the most bigoted Jews were in the habit of doing. But St John adds an ἔδει which has still deeper significance: not that it refers to any special circumstances constraining Him (such as the presence of Herod in Peræa?); or any extraordinary *haste* on His part (with which

[1] How many such colloquies may have occurred in the life of Jesus, which are not written down!

[2] Not because He could not baptize into Himself, for this was not as yet a baptism into His name. And not directly for the reason which von Gerlach suggests—to render impossible any future self-exaltation over others on account of being baptized by the Lord. But rather, as Schleiermacher says, because much baptizing would have withdrawn Him from that high work of preaching in which the disciples could not have been His representatives. Sacrament is still less than the Word (comp. 1 Cor. i. 17; Acts x. 48)—especially this preparatory baptism of repentance. At the same time He laid the deep foundation for the recognition of the services of others as valid under His commission (as Rieger remarks); and (as Bengel) caused His disciples to begin their ministry first as deacons.

ver. 40 afterwards does not accord),—for Jesus was under no constraint at all in going the way which He might purpose;—nor is it a mere geographical note that Samaria lay between, for such a degree of information might assuredly be presumed in his readers;—what then does it signify? We think that it means rather *He should* than *He must;* that is, it was an inward call, it was according to the counsel of God, that this preparatory salvation should now take place in Samaria. The other interpretation, viz., that He could not do other than take the directest road on this occasion, is inharmonious, because it rests on the assumption that Jesus would have otherwise avoided Samaria. This no Galilæan would be anxious to do, and no Jew indeed under ordinary circumstances, as we have said before. Whether this inward voice was connected with any internal, conscious impulse of Christ's will, is another question; and Luthardt may have some ground for saying that the expression excludes anything like a *designed* visitation of Samaria, in order to exert His energy there. It is enough that the Evangelist uses this ἔδει of Divine providence, in a manner which must awaken attention and thought, in order to introduce his narrative of that memorable circumstance which took place in the passage through Samaria, and which was a prophetic allusion to the second transitional stage of evangelical preaching,—the preaching to Samaria, as it is impressively announced in Acts i. 8.

The Lord now came into the neighbourhood of a city (either εἰς is *prope;* or πόλις, according to Grotius, is equivalent to *civitatis territorium*): that one, namely, which in the time of Alexander the Great had become the capital—Συχάρ or Σιχάρ, according to the correct reading, though Jerome would correct it to Συχέμ. (Acts vii. 16.) That Sichem is meant which was in the neighbourhood of Mount Gerizim, Josh. xx. 7; Judg. ix. 7. We can scarcely regard it a merely Greek termination, but very probably an opprobrious change introduced by Jewish scorn.[1] This phraseology was not simply "harmlessly retained" by St

[1] On account of their Idolatry, after שֶׁקֶר, Hab. ii. 18, which Sir. l. 27 (28) may have had in view. Or it may have been from שִׁכּוֹר, drunken, taken from Isa. xxviii. 1. The reference of Hug, which Wieseler, Lange, and Sepp sanction, to סוֹכָר or סוּכָר burying-place, is more far-fetched, since there could be no desire to change the name of a place with a memorial and

John; still less (as Hengstenberg thinks) now first introduced by him; but it was an intentional intimation of the relation and position of things between Judæa and Samaria, designed for intelligent readers, like other such premonitory hints which we shall find. The topography is given with the immediate object of laying the foundation for the woman's saying in ver. 12, but the mention of Jacob's well was enough for that; the notice of the χωρίον which Jacob gave to *Joseph* as a portion before his brethren (Gen. xlviii. 22, comp. xxxiii. 19 and Josh. xxiv. 32) should, as we think, awaken yet further thoughts, such as John and probably also our Saviour Himself would entertain in the stillness of this locality. As Pfenninger (jüd. Briefe) puts into the mouth of the disciples, and the allusion in all its force applies to the Lord Himself—"Joseph obtained a better resting-place than his brothers were disposed to give him." In connection with which one may reflect further upon the typical significance of Joseph! St John assuredly designs to fix our thoughts upon the holiness of the place,[1] and to remind us of the former consecration of a scene now so dishonoured:—Sichem was the very first place of which Abraham gained possession (Gen. xii. 6), and it was further consecrated by an altar which Jacob raised, see Gen. xxxiii. 18–20. Jacob's well (πηγή equiv. to φρέαρ ver. 11, but not a mere cistern) is, lastly, a pleasing figure or type of such ancient consecration, from the remembrance and blessing of which may be again drawn edification. It was a quarter of an hour south from the city, is still called by the Arabs Bir-Jacob, and by the Christians the Well of the Samaritan woman. Thus (as Baumgarten-Crusius referring to Lightfoot, and with him other expositors, perceive) Gen. xlix. 22 had a distant allusion, and with a symbolical meaning Deut. xxxiii. 28 a yet more direct allusion, to this Jacob's well in the good portion of Joseph.

Jesus now, weary with this wandering, sat thus by or upon the well; comp. Ex. ii. 15, ἐπὶ τοῦ φρέατος. The οὕτως, though

hallowing intention. Luthardt's view, however, who regards it with Hug as a place distinguished from Sichem, appears to be altogether doubtful. We will say nothing of Bengel's reference from Hiller's Onomasticon to שָׁכָר, reward (spoil of victory, Gen. xlviii. 22), to which the Lord is afterwards supposed to allude in ver. 36!!

[1] Which Nonnus has well seized—ἐς πόλιν ἀρχαίην.

omitted by the Syriac, is not *plane otiosum et illativum*, but to be taken as an emphatic *anaphora* of the participle κεκοπιακώς. Erasmus has it—μιμητικῶς, ut gestus exprimat hominis lassi, vel *sic nempe*, quia fatigatus. The illative *anaphora* may, indeed, as Fritzsche objects, put an enclitic οὕτως before the temp. fin.; but as certainly may it have a stronger signification in this, and in the two places of the Acts. We need not, therefore, be content with that other exposition,—"*Thus*, without any further ado, upon the first seat that He found" (Euthym. and Chrysos. ἁπλῶς καὶ ὡς ἔτυχε, Grot. incuriose, ut se locus obtulerat)—which would indicate the ἄτυφον of Christ, His humility and lowliness in lower things.[1] The *weariness* which is expressly mentioned, has more importance to the context, being closely connected with the intimation that it was *noon*. We cannot turn this sixth hour, with Rettig, into early morning (after a night's travelling); nor with Ebrard into evening: for the whole hypothesis of the Roman measurement of the day, as used by St John, is quite repugnant to our views.[2] The time of the year permitted travelling till towards noon, for it was at the end of December. Why the woman (whom Neander makes a "poor woman," we know not why) came just at that critical time to the well, is an idle question, which might have endless answers: but the question as applied to the Lord is full of significance. He does not go Himself into the town, for the time was not yet come for Him to offend the Jews by such free intercourse with Samaritans; and He would be quite alone, also, and rest awhile. It was mid-day: therefore He is weary; therefore the disciples go for bread; and there is no reason to apprehend any concourse near the well at that hour. There comes, however, a Samaritan woman (Σαμαρείας does not signify the town itself, so much as the land mentioned in ver. 4; and thus the description is equivalent to Σαμαρεῖτις, ver. 9); and as He was prepared for Nicodemus in the dark night, so is He now prepared to disturb His mid-day rest: see afterwards ver. 34. In this particular, also, the two narratives are counterparts. As soon as a soul to be won comes near Him, His thirst becomes the opportunity for

[1] Berlenb. Bib.: heut zu Tage müssen die Herren fahren!

[2] See Lücke S. 580, and Lange S. 473.

calling the wanderer to Himself. The woman does not observe or greet Him, being in fear of the contemptuous regards, perhaps the mockery, of this Jew:[1] but the Lord is not deterred by her external expression; He begins immediately that conversation with this common woman, which has been so useful to the salvation of multitudes.

Ver. 7. As this whole narrative is a complete example of mission-wisdom, so in particular is this commencement, which not obviously but surely, leads to the designed end. He who lives in the Spirit of Christ should never be at a loss for some point of introduction, should ever know how in simple brevity to hit the right mark. The woman might have naturally thought —This traveller desires to drink, water would be welcome to him; but she was no accommodating Rebekah, at least towards Jews. She draws water quietly for herself. After *she has drawn*,[2] the Lord asks her to give Him to drink; thus naturally, unostentatiously, does He begin His words to her, expressing His own most natural and human feelings, for He was sitting at noontide on the well very weary and thirsty. But by this very means He has approximated to the human sympathies of this Samaritan woman; He has obviated her prejudice and mistrust, and awakened her attention. A *request* (and the Lord did speak the language of request, as the αἰτεῖς afterwards testifies) always appeals to the existing good-will of the person requested; we despise not him whose service we ask. This is the external sense of the word; it, however, contains figurative and awakening antithesis—Here is water, as the gift of God, and I have a better gift for thee! The Lord addresses this woman specially in contrasts. By this He at once applies to her a test, as when (Gen. xxiv. 45) one was similarly to be invited out of Nahor's family to Abraham. For it is to be understood that the Lord's design goes further from the very beginning; that, seeing this soul

[1] Lightfoot and Witsius in the Dekaphylon, and Sepp also, ii. 450, give examples of similar conversations of Jews passing through Samaria.

[2] Which Nonnus forgets not to insert. It is not so written, but it cannot be supposed that the Lord would otherwise have so abruptly put the question. He addresses the woman who had come before, whom He had attentively observed and watched for a while—just as *she was coming*.

presenting herself at so apt a time for private conversation, He immediately laid His plan to secure it. He experiences in human weakness thirst, but He is far from being confined to that consideration; He yields, even thus oppressed, to the longing to do His Father's work. This slight word is thus no less than the truest utterance of His own spiritual desire—Refresh My soul's love, thou poor sinner; I am seeking thee, be found of Me!

The Evangelist tells us parenthetically that the disciples had gone away; and thus explains how it was that the Lord asked for His own refreshment, and the reason, generally, of His holding this intercourse with the woman.[1] Schleiermacher's observation here is strangely out of place:—"We cannot suppose that they would leave Him altogether alone; doubtless one or other of the disciples was with Him." This is a strange method of reading what is so plainly written. The astonished woman recognised the Jew, rather by his clothing (after the manner of the Rabbies), than by His softer dialect; which would scarcely have betrayed itself in so few words.[2] Such intercourse as necessary purchase of food in travelling was expressly excepted from the general prohibition;[3] but to *ask* to drink, and then to drink out of her pitcher, transgressed this limit, and approached very near to the forbidden *συγχρᾶσθαι*. The artless woman, whose thoughts are already upon her lips, puts the question which follows, not *merely* out of curiosity (according to Nonnus), but from the slight feeling of elevation which such a woman—not held in very high honour in the town! would naturally feel on being thus humbly requested by a stranger, and a Jew. Though

[1] Not, however, signifying that *they* would otherwise have drawn for Him: certainly not "that they had taken the *ἄντλημα* with them!" If we did think about their baggage at all, we should not suppose that they would carry it hither and thither. The disciples were not so forgetful of their Master's earthly need: if they had had this *ἄντλημα* (*κάδον ἑλκυστῆρα* Nonn.) He would have asked *them*.

[2] If the Samaritans, like the Ephraimites of old (Judg. xii. 6), were still distinguished by lack of the sibilant in their pronunciation, the words which were probably spoken הַשְׁקִינִי נָא or תְּנִי לִי לִשְׁתּוֹת would have been enough.

[3] If Jesus had sent the disciples into the town, contrary to custom, in order to break down prejudice, why did He not go Himself?

Lange's words, "Her national feeling is flattered by being thus appealed to for help," may be too strong, yet we cannot but agree with Lücke and Klee that there is something of proud or capricious bantering in her answer, which seems, instead of bestowing the favour, to protest against it. Her curiosity must first know why He, contrary to Jewish custom, put such a request to her; she defers till He has explained that. (Thus Luthardt excellently.) And Klee adds, "If the good-natured woman had not been somewhat satirical in her disposition, she would have granted a thirsty man the water which he longed for at once; but she must at all costs gratify her humoursome spirit." Instead, that is, of doing what was so naturally to be expected, and reaching out the pitcher to the traveller (Nonnus—*ξεινήϊον ὕδωρ*, hospitalis aqua)! The Lord, who penetrated her natural disposition, foresaw this. Wondering, as she did, what manner of Jew He could be, He had yet more astonishment in store for her. The water is untouched, however, at least till the end of the conversation, when the pitcher remains behind; He thinks not of that, does not say—Let me drink first—but goes on to *answer* her.

Ver. 10. The Lord's words hasten, without any pause, to the mystery of the spiritual gift which He offers. The critical point of exposition here is to ascertain what is now meant by the *gift of God;* but expositors will never satisfactorily deal with it, while they refuse to admit the essential and natural *fulness of meaning* which this wonderful word suggests. It is therefore unwise and injudicious to say, as even some of the best of them do, that the Lord's own person cannot be meant, because this is referred to afterwards in the *καὶ τίς ἐστιν*! More properly, the Lord advances and develops the deep and comprehensive meaning of this first word, step by step, up to the *ὕδωρ ζῶν*. That gift is, first of all, the water itself which was asked for refreshment: and this water is seized by Divine wisdom, and made a similitude and point of connection for the discourse of higher blessings. This has been strangely overlooked by most expositors, with the exception, however, of Pfenninger, who interprets the Lord—"*this* water is the gift of God to all who thirst." The words convey a slight reproach that she should for a moment have denied to Him a gift of God which was intended for Him and for all: but

its immediate effect would be to raise her thoughts out of the narrow and customary circle, to the contemplation of God as the Giver of everything needful for bodily life. It is the same point of connection as in Acts xiv. 17. Man receives his bread and rain and earthly good of every kind as the "gift of God;" but does not *think* of it as such, till it is brought solemnly and impressively before his thoughts.

It is, therefore, primarily this water which is the gift of God: but the woman must acknowledge it as such, that is, understand it still further in its *limitation*, ver. 13, and its true *significance*, ver. 14. Discerning God's love in such gifts, we should be led in thankful uplifting of our hearts to seek His higher salvation. We should be deeply sensible both of what these earthly gifts *can* supply, and what they *cannot;* should be led to expect that the gracious Giver of these may also have supplies for the soul's necessity, and thus come to regard all perishable good as being but a similitude and type of something higher. He who does not thus rise from the gift to the *Giver*, *discerns* not the gift itself, *knows* not wherefore it was given. Coming and going to draw water, reflect upon the deeper thirst of thy spirit![1] Wherefore, indeed, do we thus eat and drink? Simply that we may live awhile in constant alternation of desire and its transient gratification; and then? What is the design of *this life*, which God by meat and drink is constantly renewing, and what should be its aim? To know *Him*, who giveth all things; and whose will is to give Himself to the soul which sprang from Him, and in its deepest principle thirsts for Him again. Then we might have expected His words to continue—"And who that *God* is, whom thou ignorantly worshippest, what His will is, and what thou mightest receive from Him." But *instead of* this, the Son of man who was speaking to her most impressively and significantly puts Himself in the place of the great, unacknowledged *Giver!* This, then, is the second stage in His meaning—*And Who it is!* She may well have already perceived that this Person, who expressed His need in so uncustomary and illegal a manner, was no ordinary Ἰουδαῖος or ἄνθρωπος, and thus have heard the answer to her own question. But still further, thirdly: *That saith to thee, give Me to drink!*

[1] "Man is full of hunger and thirst: in this is the element of his heaven, and also of his hell."—RIEGER.

Let it be noted here how the Lord in His dignity elevates her expression *αἰτεῖς* into *λέγω σοι*; in order to put the *αἰτεῖν* more appropriately into her own lips. It already anticipates His subsequent *ὁ λαλῶν σοι*, ver. 26. It seems to signify—Who hath yet more both to give and to say to thee. Thus then the gift of God is properly enough made to signify this "opportunity of hearing, and deriving good from Jesus:" but this is neither the first nor the last meaning, as the *ἔδωκεν ἄν σοι* attached to the *δωρεά* evidently shows. Jesus has not merely somewhat *to say*, but somewhat thereby and therein *to give;* and emphatically because *He Himself is* the Gift of all gifts for us. This innermost point of the meaning is well seized by Brandt's Schullehrerbibel—"What God's will is to give thee now," but it fails to say—*through Me!* Hadst thou before known what I will now tell thee, thou wouldst have anticipated my asking (*ἤτησας*, Vulg. forsitan petisses, Winer § 43)—and He, who is now a petitioner to thee, and whose request thou mistrustest and dost hesitate to grant, *would have given thee living water!* Here then is, in conclusion, the full meaning of the gift of God; comprehending in one the two sayings of the Lord, vers. 5 and 16, in His conversation with Nicodemus. Let the designed *double meaning* of this word, as used by our Saviour, be observed: He knows, for it is indeed His design, that she who hears Him will understand His words according to the ordinary usage of מַיִם חַיִּים for spring-water. (Gen. xxvi. 19; Lev. xiv. 5; Cant. iv. 15.) His meaning is that which in the prophets is often expressed by this figure: but He cannot appeal to them in speaking to a Samaritan; and aims therefore to excite her desire by an enigmatical word, which itself is afterwards to be explained. He completes all, and renders His testimony applicable to all future times, by laying down the condition of *prayer* in order to His *gift.* By the supposition that she would have asked, if she had *known*, He graciously softens the reproach of her ignorance. It is in infinite love that He expresses His desire to make Himself known. (Luke xix. 42.)

But she knows not nor understands as yet. Her second rejoinder, which seems to have a more diffuse character, bubbling up more in the style of women's talk at the well, as exhibited 1 Sam. ix. 12, 13, carries on the former thus:—How should I, a

Samaritan, ask from Thee, a Jew, water which could be better than that which our own Jacob's well gives us? Her words are incomparably picturesque in their echo of His. The first impression of the marvellous stranger, and His mysterious words, extorted from her the Κύριε, which was more than the Ἰουδαῖος ὤν with which her suspicion had previously measured Him, and seemed to flow immediately out of His own τίς ἐστιν. For though that word might have been the ordinary appellation of any dignified stranger, and used modestly even to one unknown (ch. xx. 15), yet *this* woman had been by no means so complaisant, her first word to the supposed "Jew" was the bare and simple σύ. Now, however, in the *unconscious* depths of her *feeling* there is doubtless some presentiment which corresponds with what Euthymius rather too hastily infers—νομίσασα μέγαν εἶναί τινα. But instead of proceeding onwards from this impression, and improving upon it, she sinks back into the ordinary level of mere common remark again: she does not follow it up by saying—Κύριε, καλῶς εἶπας, οὐκ οἶδα, ἀνάγγελλέ μοι. She looks fixedly at this κύριος, and with increased boldness alleges to Him the folly, and, as it appears to her, impossibility of His promise. (The stages of her thoughts as they progress, are marked by the anomalous καί after οὔτε.) Thou hast nothing to draw with, as I have:[1]—indeed, it was by reason of this that He had first asked water of her, afterwards speaking of some other water. But this *other*—it must be *water*, and therefore she adds —And the well is *deep*:[2]—Thou canst not penetrate to the spring below; if Thou meanest water different from mine, it being immediately fresh from the deep fountain: whence then *hast thou that* "living water" (mark the double article!) so as that thou *wouldst have* given it to me, as thou sayest? *Or* dost thou refer to some better well, ignorantly holding this for a mere cistern? This leads to what now follows, the proud vindication of Jacob's

[1] It was not the common public well of the city, which was at some distance, hence no mechanical provision for drawing the water was made. It was only honoured as Jacob's well—and the woman did not necessarily come from the city direct. So Robinson.

[2] According to recent travellers, one hundred and five feet deep, with only five feet of water now in it. Moreover, there were many springs round Mount Gerizim, the holy mount of the Samaritans, besides this,—according to the popular saying three hundred and sixty-five.

well; so that the whole of what she says appears more and more, especially at the last, zealously and warmly spoken.

Thus only can we rightly apprehend her rejoinder. It is impossible to ascribe, with Schleiermacher, any spiritual conception of the subject to the woman as yet. This actually misleads him in his preaching to interpret as if the woman only wondered, in the Old Testament sense, at the fact of the better water which Jesus brought being attainable without trouble and without any direct instrumentality, and only through prayer! That makes a very beautiful application, but fails to hit the exact meaning of the words. The woman does not suspect as yet (as Klee also thinks) that water essentially different was signified in the promise; the increasing contradiction of ver. 12 is quite inconsistent with such a thought.

Dost Thou throw scorn upon *us* Samaritans and our Jacob's well? Hast Thou joined Thyself to me as a *Jew* to reproach and mock only? Lange speaks strongly his idea, "it probably was essential to the orthodoxy of the Samaritans, that the water of this well should be better than that of all other springs." Certainly it is not without something of contradicting pride that she assumes a right, equal to that of the Jews, to say—*our* father Jacob. And indeed here where he dwelt, with yet stricter right.[1] The Samaritans, called by the Lord Himself, Luke xvii. 18, ἀλλογενεῖς (if not ἀλλόφυλοι, Acts x. 28), and designated by Josephus ἀλλοεθνεῖς, claimed nevertheless (according to Joseph. Ant. ix. 14, xi. 8) to have sprung especially from *Joseph*—hence she says *gave us*, because he gave this χωρίον to Joseph. (Robinson—He dug the well, though there were other springs in the neighbourhood, in order to show his proprietorship?) This already explains the ἔδωκεν, unusual concerning a well, but it contains also something like an antithesis to the previous "gift of God," though vaguely, as was necessary in such speaking. As soon as the customary language concerning the gift of God is used earnestly, and further instruction begins to be founded upon it, the protest is uttered and the discourse is lowered to subordinate givers. Our father Jacob was a skilful shepherd and agriculturist, and knew well the value of good water. His

[1] Lange:—She claims the father Jacob so strictly for the Samaritans, as almost to deny him to the Jews.

well has ever given wholesome water, and *sufficient* for man and beast. He himself was contented with it—and his children *and his cattle!*[1] Marvellous simplicity which provokes the question —Can *such* water, then, be the sufficing, adequate gift of God for *men?* Here is reflected the wretched contentedness of the natural man, who takes offence at the offer of anything better, and "resents it as if he lacked nothing." (Berlenb. Bib.) Let this—*art thou better?* be compared with that other in chap. viii. 53. And let it be further applied to the evidence of similar complacency in derived advantages from ancestry, which is everywhere so common.[2] Finally, let it be borne in mind that the dulness and lack of comprehension in this poor *Samaritan woman*, is by far less guilty than the same blindness of understanding in the rulers of Israel.

Ver. 13. The Lord does not blame and reprove in return; He wisely and graciously does not commit Himself to any discussion of the interjected question *μὴ σύ μείζων εἶ*, "to any comparison of His own person with the patriarch Jacob's dignity;"[3] but He adheres closely to the matter itself, and continues to impress the claims of the great gift offered to man's need. The second question concerning the person rested upon the first as to what kind of water it could be; that again was founded upon a total lack of comprehension, and the Lord reveals *this*, in order to give her full explanation. He embraces the whole of the woman's hasty and enforced thoughts in one, seizing and firmly holding her mind, which already began to discern the difference, almost amounting to a *contrast*, between the one water and the other, and had been constrained to apply the marvelling *πόθεν* to this marvellous other water. Just so did

[1] *Θρέμματα*, Vulg. pecora, similarly Syr. and Nonnus. The interpretation "domestics" admits of no clear demonstration; for the general alumni see Lampe after Majus, but this indefinite generality does not suit the woman's language, as Lampe himself thinks. On the other hand, it does seem to be a falling off in her lofty language, to descend from father Jacob's sacred person to his cattle.

[2] Hiller in Leben Jesu:—yet Samaria remained no more than Samaria, though Jacob dwelt, and Joseph was buried, there. What avails it to have the mere relics of saints?

[3] Although Lampe, without any true propriety, says of what follows—demonstrat, se revera majorem Jacobo esse!

the Lord desire to lead onward her thoughts, and therefore says emphatically first—*This* water which is also for the cattle, *this water* does not satisfy you *men!* Whosoever drinketh of this water shall thirst again—this is the most simple and certain experience, which every man admits, without reflecting upon that which is latently confessed with it! This first sentence already hints at the following, and prepares the way for the full and absolute contrast. For this common experience assuredly gives its intimation, and bears its witness, that *this* water is in reality only the water of death, that is, that it cannot avail to hinder death and after it an eternal thirst or famishing. This the Lord expressly declares afterwards in connection with the manna, which could never be the true bread of *life*, chap. vi. 49, 58. The word which the Lord here utters to the woman of Samaria is a very apt superscription for the well;—and for every other place which the people frequent to draw from, every other merely human *school*, with all its fulness of application. For the Lord, in speaking thus concerning this water, only regards it as a symbol and similitude of every human satisfaction of every human need both in body and *soul;*—else would the contrast, which the Lord continues to expand, fail of being all-comprehensive. Human language generally has adopted thirst as the common expression for desire of every kind—hence we find it in holy writ, *e.g.*, Prov. v. 15, ix. 17. All carnal pleasure, such as this woman lived in; all that fleshly and unfruitful knowledge which so many men pursue; all delights and all enjoyments which the earth, *this world* may offer, can satisfy our thirst with a brief and transitory gratification alone, such as only in reality increases the thirst-sickness which it professes to allay.[1]

Ver. 14. Our Lord's word here has nothing to do with the Rabbinical phrases, "to drink water out of any man's well," that is, to be His disciple: but it does coincide fundamentally with all those references to a heavenly and real water, to which we alluded on ch. iii. 5. The water which the Lord gives, is spirit and life; yet apprehended under a material form, for the exhi-

[1] Lampe quotes a Jewish proverb to that end:—כל אשר ישתה מהם יוסיף צמאו.

bition of which we may refer to ch. vii. 37, 38. No earthly well supplies this, no Father Jacob or Father *Luther*, no Doctor or Professor—but the Lord, who again offers it at the close of Scripture, Rev. xxii. 17, graciously promises it here by a repeated δώσω, a future tense which involves, however, the before-imposed condition of prayer. Ὃς δ' ἂν πίῃ—not merely, who drinks thereof a little, but a continual, earnest, full and thorough drinking is signified. (Hence Wesley says rightly—provided he continue to drink thereof.) It is to such drinking that the superabounding promise is given, of never thirsting again for ever; comp. ch. vi. 35. It is in the highest degree probable that the Lord's thoughts refer—though not to the woman's apprehension—to an apocryphal utterance of the son of Sirach in ch. xxiv. ver. 19 of which (in von Meyer, ver. 21, Luther, ver. 25) is echoed in Matt. xi. 28. In ver. 21 of that chapter (von Meyer, ver. 23; Luther, 28, 29), wisdom promises—*οἱ ἐσθίοντές με ἔτι πεινάσουσι, καὶ οἱ πίνοντές με ἔτι διψήσουσιν*; but that has its truth in the *Old Testament* more imperfect expression and meaning, which the Lord very significantly intensifies and reverses. For what the Old Testament exhibits and points to in the distance, for the inexhaustible excitement of an unceasing seeking and endeavour, becomes now in the present fulfilment of the new covenant, an immediate satisfaction, pouring already into time the satisfaction of eternity.[1] But he only is for ever satisfied, who has perfectly and to the end drunk of this water. That water is near and at hand, it is with the man and in himself, but the drawing and drinking must nevertheless still continue. Ubi sitis recurrit, hominis non aquæ defectus—says Bengel very beautifully. For it must be ever remembered that we ourselves are not the spring, but the gift of God within us. We must add that *this* thirst is not a painful, uneasy impulse, but the serene and contented receiving from grace to grace. So that the most direct and literal meaning of *οὐ μὴ διψήσῃ* is—He shall never more thirst for earthly water, shall never know the delusive vicissitudes of apparent satisfaction; but has attained and enjoys, though in progressive degrees, the unexhausted and full satisfaction of the true life. If the emphasis be laid

[1] See upon this Ullmann in the Stud. u. Krit. 1828 iv. S. 791.

upon εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, it runs—He shall *one day* thirst no more for ever.

Thus has the Lord clearly explained how He will have the figurative ὕδωρ ζῶν understood, comp. Ps. xxxvi. 10; Jer. ii. 13, xvii. 13. *Water*, which produces and imparts eternal life! But we may doubt whether in this figurative discourse, which in its relations must not be too strictly interpreted, He designed to distinguish (as Luthardt thinks) the ζωή as a property and energy from the independent, substantial ὕδωρ itself: we may perceive this distinction in the words, but it could scarcely be intended by the Lord on such an occasion for such a hearer. Spiritual *life* out of God who is spirit, is a πηγή a fountain in the most distinctive sense, in contrast with which all the fountains of earth are no better than φρέατα: the true *spring*-water is only that which is spiritual, and which becomes itself a permanent *fountain*. The streaming forth of spiritual life from believers towards others is not *here immediately spoken of:* the emphasis lies upon the fact that he who drinks has truly the spring ἐν ἑαυτῷ. Ὕδωρ ἁλλόμενον is ζῶν in the *first* meaning of the figure, according to Hesych. ἀεὶ ῥέον ἢ βλύζον, that is, not drying up, but as a permanent fountain springing or bubbling up (with a verbum *amœnum*, as Bengel says, without Latinism); the addition of εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον first of all strengthens the previous εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα (altogether perennial, and never more drying up), and then opens up the *second*, and most internal meaning of the word ζῶν, that is, ζωοποιοῦν. (Nonnus: φυσίζοον ὕδωρ.) "The word *life* is one by which man's conscience may ever be convinced" (Berlenb. Bib.). All the fountains of worldly pleasure and worldly wisdom, however vigorously and joyously they may spring, flow only in *this* life, in this transitory and mortal life, and thirst in death must inevitably ensue. Oh that men would take note in time of the manifest signs of approaching failure in the sources of their joy, before the end comes when *to them* the great cistern will be broken, and they shall find out to their own bitter sorrow that they have only been swallowing its draughts unto eternal woe! But he who has received in himself the living fountain shall enter with it into the fulness of eternal life, into that boundless ocean, from which is derived and to which returns the spring within his soul. Thus it is *not*

merely (as Luthardt thinks, comparing ch. vi. 27) εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον as a spring which flows *towards* eternal life, and finally leads to its bestowment, but *that life is in it*—the eternal flows back to the eternal again!

He who would discern nothing more in the next rejoinder of the woman than an inconsiderate desire to put an end to a matter which becomes more and more incomprehensible to her,[1] does her great injustice, and can scarcely harmonize with such a notion her subsequent undoubted conversion. How stands it then? She has either attained now a spiritual apprehension of the Lord's meaning, or she has so much misunderstood it as to suppose Him to mean a miraculous, and as it were, magical water for physical thirst. Let us investigate this dilemma. In the former case two things are possible. If she had *altogether understood* Him, then she must be considered as either entering into the Lord's figurative meaning, and using similarly *figurative* language; on which supposition her words μηδὲ ἔρχωμαι ἐνθάδε ἀντλεῖν would signify—that I may no more foolishly and vainly seek my satisfaction in earthly things. But this seems to us evidently *beyond* her capacity at that time! And then the new reference to her sin in ver. 16 would be unnecessary, and even incomprehensible. *Or* she spoke the latter strange words because she would *feign herself* not to have understood, falling however into a strange contradiction in her words. But this is not admissible, for it opposes the artless character of all her sayings (ver. 17 is only a half-untruth, a timid half-confession). There remains the second supposition of an entire misapprehension, as if the Lord possessed some supernatural water which would for ever quench all bodily thirst. But we think this also quite inadmissible, for the Lord had already spoken of *eternal life*, and she has a consciousness of His meaning which appears presently to be deeply stirred. Hence we cannot escape from the solution which ascribes to her the same internal position of mind which was detected in the objection of Nicodemus, chap. iii. 4: She does not clearly know what she says or would say, she wavers between the dawning

[1] J. G. Müller (vom Glauben der Christen, i. 136) gives the climax of this:—"The woman cannot comprehend the matter at all, and answers petulantly: she seems to have been but little disposed to know the true meaning of His words."

apprehension of the higher meaning, and the clinging of her mind to the lower. Just, in the same way, we think, the natural man commonly acts in similar circumstances, when the testimony concerning spiritual blessings is brought home to his conscience. Τοῦτο τὸ ὕδωρ testifies that she had apprehended the *difference* between this water and the ordinary water which any ἄντλημα might anywhere draw; however dull of understanding she had been when the Lord first spoke, His second saying had effectually opened her ears. Thus she now *asks*—δός μοι—as the Lord had desired. But as to the addition concerning not coming thither again to draw? In this we perceive an intermixture of the former mind, which cannot yet detach itself from the earthly and visible: behind it there *lurks*, though without any conscious *dissimulation* on her part, an imperfect apprehension which was not yet perfectly accessible to the Lord's influence; and her words are strictly parallel with that equally strange request for the bread in eating which man should not die, chap. vi. 34.—There is much well-meant aspiration for spiritual comfort, yea much application disertis verbis for "the Holy Spirit" among Christian men, which very little differs from this; he who offers it often knows as little what it imports as this woman, having only a vague and carnal notion of an indefinite and mysterious good, as it is well expressed by the Berlenb. Bible—"If Thou canst set me free from all the harassing conditions of this life, so that I have no longer to labour and toil, it will content me well." Yea, verily, they would be glad enough to have such bread and such water without trouble, and without the uneasiness of recurring desire, but they do not truly know what is signified by the words, and how the intended blessings are to be made theirs. Schweizer is right in saying that there is a glimmering of *doubt* in the paradoxical conclusion of her words, and we can scarcely deny the faint appearance of something akin to it like *irony:*[1] but we must protest against any

[1] Lampe: sarcasticum quid subesse videtur—which he then expounds, —ad minimum *tentare voluit audacula*, quomodo Jesus præstita petitionis conditione promissum suum executioni daturus esset. According to Nonnus, whose apt and striking thoughts must not be overlooked in his tumid diction, the woman speaks as ἀγκυλόμητις concerning the promised βιοτήσιον ὕδωρ in opposition to the common βεβιημένον ὕδωρ.

imputation of frivolity or *bantering* as such.[1] All this is past with her. She would fain apprehend the Lord's meaning, but she cannot; hence she diverges into gross misapprehension, falls back into carnal ideas and expectations, just as the natural man ever does when beginning in his own way to understand the *promise* of evangelical gifts and grace. This divergence, however ingeniously it expresses itself, takes place without any design and calculation. The first gracious presentation of the Gospel which only offers a positive comfort and salvation, finds no fit place in the heart of man until the *conviction of sin* is produced. Yet it is not in vain that the promise leads the way, for it loosens and softens the ground of the heart, and prevents the gracious severity which follows from being proudly repelled.

Ver. 16. The remark of Grotius upon this passage—non satis decorum est, nuptæ beneficium conferre marito inconscio—of course refers to the *apparent* connection which these abrupt words might be thought to have with the previous remark: he does not intend to deny the obvious and only design of our Lord to penetrate by them into the secret and sinful life of the woman. Every sincere reader and expositor has been contented with this view from the beginning; no other has ever been sought. Baumgarten-Crusius with his objectivity, which is often laudable enough, while he gives us to understand that he does not lay much stress upon the minute historical accuracy of these accounts, yet appeals to a simple feeling shared by all, when he says, "it is evident that, according to the Evangelist's design, this *φώνησον τὸν ἄνδρα σου* must be regarded as a concealed question put to the woman." So, indeed, it is evident, but also evident that such as the Evangelist exhibits it was the Lord's design.[2] Bretschneider has been very severe upon this "disguised question;" we cannot, however, perceive in such a human, and as it were ironical, turn to the conversation, any the slightest disparagement to the Lord's dignity: but we do perceive

[1] Luthardt discerns such a tone in her request, as if she would then think herself well provided for; it may appear in the *form* of her words, which conceal nothing that is in her heart, even the most secret thing: but if so it must be assumed with design, for in her heart there is now no trifling!

[2] Euthymius—*προσποιούμενος ὅτι χρὴ κἀκεῖνον κοινωνῆσαι ταύτῃ τοῦ ὕδρου.*

much that is quite inharmonious in every other view of the train of thought which would regard Him as intending in simple earnest to have the husband called. He has already broken through the Jewish and Rabbinical rules for conversation with women, and continues to break through them by calmly pursuing His colloquy with this woman without her husband. What Lange has lately advanced concerning the crisis having occurred, which would require the presence of the presumed husband, is in the highest degree forced and unnatural. "Now first she has shown herself inclined to become a disciple of Jesus, and to enter into a nearer relation with Him"—but this is a strange interpretation of ver. 15. "It is according to the highest and most scrupulous sense of social propriety, that just at this crisis the woman should call her husband"—and Lange finds force in this, notwithstanding his presupposing the Lord's knowledge of the relation in which this "husband" stood. But then rises the much more harsh necessity of assuming that the Lord for a single moment acknowledged him as her true *husband:* He would then have spoken with less propriety than the woman herself.[1] Apart from the inappropriateness of applying such human proprieties to our Saviour in His redeeming work, so dissonant from His sacred freedom, and dignity, and purity; we must assume that the Son of God in the flesh would act as God has ever acted, teaching and converting to Himself women without any constrained reference to their husbands. *Such* decorum as would not permit this, is in the highest degree opposed to His higher and Divine propriety![2] If it is supposed that the Lord did in reality bid her summon her husband, we must be driven to the notion which Lücke, appealing to some of

[1] Which objection is not refuted by Lange's reply (iii. 581). His example from the minors being made Roman Catholics without the knowledge and consent of their parents is not to the point, inasmuch as a woman in matters of ecclesiastical and spiritual right is not under the authority of a husband, as a minor. No evangelical preacher would first seek the concurrence of her husband, before the conversion of the wife.

[2] The limits which propriety draws, on account of our liability to temptation, if any such are worth considering, have no place here. This flashes upon us immediately when we read Hezel's coarse and bold remark—"um ihr auch die schwache Vermuthung, als habe er auf sie als Frau Absichten, zu benehmen!"

the fathers, openly espouses—that the woman s answer first awakened His prophetical gift, and came *unexpected* to Himself. But this, as Lange felt, is most unsuitable, and not to be thought of: that would be a most erroneous supposition after such long and testing spiritual intercourse with this woman! We shall in vain look in the Gospels for any similar example of mistake: He may indeed be regarded as *not knowing* some things external, and inquiring concerning them (as Mark v. 30); but it was utterly impossible that He should *think* anything to stand differently from the reality, or that He should strangely presume the woman to have a husband when she had none, as it was not necessary that she should be supposed married at all. And this too in the midst of the most vital communion with her penetrated soul:—for we find in general that His prophetic glance through the spirits of men, and all the circumstances of their life, is not first excited by critical and abrupt conjunctures, but goes parallel and is one with the spiritual conviction which He works in them. Thus He has progressively been seizing upon the conscience, and piercing the spirit of this woman, from the very beginning; and we cannot tolerate the thought that He could err at this point in any thing concerning her life. When the time has come to detect and reveal it, He knows everything full well.

As it regards the ability of the pure Son of man, in whom dwells the word and light of God, to penetrate, independently of the Divine omniscience, the secrets of the human heart, especially in the case of humanity standing in His presence, we have often already expressed our views: on this point we almost entirely agree with Lange, apart from his strange, materialising notion that the woman exhibited to the Lord traces which He could decipher of the individual influence of each of the five husbands upon her spirit, just as the circles of the tree betray its age to the forester![1]—Enough that the Lord knows—and from this point he proceeds anew—that the woman has now no proper husband. Under the appearance, assumed for a moment only at the furthest, that He knows not this, and would for propriety's

[1] Pelt also takes exception (in Reuter's Repertorium 1849. Jan. S. 32) to these wood-marks—and Lange defends himself again in the Preface to his Dogmatik.

sake have the husband present,[1] He connects in a striking manner His ἐλθὲ ἐνθάδε with her μηδὲ ἔρχωμαι ἐνθάδε, and seemed to say, as she might have understood Him—"Now must thou first truly come *hither, to Me*, to draw the water of life; but in order to that go at once, as thou wert until now, and come back other than thou wert—*bring with thee thy sin*, that we may then proceed to speak further together!" Just so does He ensure to her her request, and opens a free path to her endless satisfaction even while He is reproving and drawing her to a full confession. How graciously does He dispense with the long "preaching of condemnation," and yet how directly does He seize and disclose her guilt! "He lays His finger on the wound, but with so tender a touch as if He feared to aggravate her woe." (Berlenb. Bib.)

Vers. 17, 18. "Husband"—no one else probably had ever thus designated to herself him with whom she now lived.[2] So that she contradicts it; not however with a bold denial, but with a smitten conscience, suddenly and unexpectedly awakened. Her rejoinder slowly echoes and emphasises this ἄνδρα, half in the tone of *confession*, as if she had said—"I *have* indeed some one, but not as a *husband*." We are not only required by the psychological view of the whole so to interpret it, but we presently find that the Lord (certainly not contrary to the truth) so interprets it. Indeed He goes further; He only gently intimates and with the slightest possible irony, by the *first* "καλῶς" in connection with which the ambiguous ἄνδρα is placed first, that He perceives the hesitating falseness of her half-confession; but He then instantly proceeds, and thereby gives us an example for all similar cases, to draw out affectionately into the light the inward self-condemnation which lay concealed in her diffident words, and accepts the half-acknowledgment as if it lacked nothing.

[1] No more than this! For He might have uttered the word with such a look and tone as to convict the woman at once, and this is to us more probable. There lay also in the background of this ostensible request a requirement, which would echo afterwards from it in the woman's ears, to call also her lover to the mercy of Christ.

[2] Although the Lord so spake, using only for the moment the careless language of sinners, in order to her condemnation; and ver. 18 sufficiently vindicates His meaning.

Hence the two-fold καλῶς εἶπας, ἀληθὲς εἴρηκας; although τοῦτο in the second case has in it something of reproof—*This time* thou hast told the truth,[1] thou hast not always. With this there was associated that most gracious look, which plainly told her that His design was not that of simple and continual condemnation of her offence, and which encouraged her to the further questioning of vers. 19, 20.[2]

But now as to the *five husbands*—what is their relation to the history, and what do they signify? They are mentioned first of all for the sake of bringing them into plain *contrast* with him who was *not* her husband. But then the number *five* (not merely several or many already) would show her that the penetrating eye of the Searcher of hearts reached to all the *specialities* of her past manner of life, and all the detail of her sins:—I know thee and everything connected with thee, all that thy commerce with these five husbands involves—God knoweth the whole! For that the question is here of manifold guilt on her own side, is made very plain by her own word and open confession—εἶπε μοι πάντα ὅσα ἐποίησα, ver. 39. Even if the men had all died by their special misfortune, we could not avoid imputing evil to a widow so often re-married. But this is the least probable supposition among all that may be made;[3] it is likely that many methods of dissolving the nuptial bond had concurred here; in any case there is indicated an immoderate passion in this woman which could not be extinguished by any repetition of separation or widowhood. "Thou *hast had* five husbands already; thou wilt know my meaning, I will speak no further of that—although thou seest that I know all—how thou hast loosed thyself from the one, and bound thyself to the other!" We think immediately "through divorce, death, impropriety" (Meyer's note)—other and worse suppositions are indeed *possible;* not merely that one or another could not per-

[1] Properly—*this* word as a truth, for τοῦτο is object, and ἀληθές predicate.

[2] Ὃν ἔχεις, which is only taken from her ἔχω, is groundlessly pressed to mean that she held him to herself, as it were, through unbridled desire! See the note in Lampe from Pseudo-Athanasius.

[3] Chrysostom's strange notion (in Psalm xiii.) that she had lived with the five in similar illicit intercourse, is altogether out of the question, since the Lord opposes the five, externally at least lawful husbands, to the sixth.

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA.

manently remain with her, that she gave just cause for divorce, or was guilty of living in connection with more than one, and so on. For the remark is not unimportant, that while according to the Jewish law a woman might, without any personal fault (apart from the continual re-marriage) be put away by five consecutive despotic husbands, the Samaritans did not entertain the Pharisaic extension of the Mosaic law of divorce; as we find it expressly laid down in the Tract. Kidduschim in relation to the "Cuthites." [1]

Thus, after one lightning-glance through her whole life which lighted up to her all its evil, the Lord seizes the sinner's conscience by her last, then existing, and current sin; laying hold upon it as the crown and consummation of all former sins. So far had she gone, that after five marriages she could live in carnal intercourse altogether without marriage. For even if the οὐκ in οὐκ ἔστι σου ἀνήρ might be made to stand for *nondum*,[2] there yet remains in ἔχειν the guilty anticipation of intercourse. But οὐκ ἀνήρ itself is strongly condemnatory; and the σοῦ which precedes might even be regarded as signifying—he is not *thine*, but another's husband! It does, however, and this is all we can say, distinguish this poor woman from a πόρνη *vulgivaga;* she adhered to one man, as if he were her husband. But the connection is that of the flesh, and there does not enter into it any love of the soul; for, when converted she avoids at first this companion of her sin, and says nothing, ver. 28, to this "husband" whom the Lord's word, ver. 16, had thus associated with her.[3]

[1] We unhesitatingly protest, with Lücke and Lange, resting upon the historical simplicity and truth of the whole narrative, against the allegorical reference to the fivefold idolatry of Samaria, and its present half-worship of Jehovah (so that the woman becomes a representative of her land, as Sepp asserts again of the adulteress in Jerusalem, Jno. viii.)—an allegorical reference which Hengstenberg first broached, and which Dr Bauer and Strauss have made a bad use of. There is nothing allegorical here (although both Origen and Augustine have mystified the number five), no Jewish proverb concerning the Samaritans referred to the woman, but a simple concurrence of circumstances without anything peculiarly remarkable in themselves.

[2] Witthof Opusc. the first treatise de muliere Samaritana, sexto viro *desponsatâ*.

[3] Hence Pfenninger has improperly interwoven this.

We have already intimated how it came to pass that she could abruptly change the theme, and proceed to further questioning. Most expositors discern here nothing more than an insusceptible, yea even recalcitrating *repulsion* and *evasion* of the subject. According to J. G. Müller it is with woman's dexterity and cunning that she passes from the shameful subject to a politico-theological discussion; but this would indicate too much wickedness, and then her first words, "Sir, I perceive that Thou art a prophet" would involve such a degree of hardness of heart, and capricious thoughtlessness, as is quite at variance with the result of the whole colloquy. But we do not find, in the most modified sense, anything like *diversion* or *evasion*.[1] Supposing her to be the subject of an impulse of true repentance—and we cannot suppose it otherwise after such a piercing revelation—she could not have voluntarily and deliberately broken off the matter at that very point. If she had, as we believe, already uttered a half-confession, why should we be loth to admit that she designs to complete it now? She herself indicates to us afterwards, ver. 29, the mighty force of this critical moment as having awakened her to *faith*. The strong θεωρῶ which she declares is proof sufficient of the earnestness with which she beheld in this Jew, whom she had never before seen, but who nevertheless knew so well her own, a Samaritan's, life and family history, and who had spoken such marvellous words to her, a man of God, a *Prophet;* but who could trifle immediately with a prophet thus solemnly acknowledged, who could put petulant controversial questions to such an one, or harshly lay before him sudden "scruples of conscience!" Consequently we must regard her question about the true place of prayer, as equally earnest with her declaration that she perceived Jesus to be a prophet. To Nathanael the Lord disclosed his secret prayer, to this woman her sin. Without having recourse to any supposition of designed

[1] Ebrard: "Profoundly ashamed, and brought to a piercing sense of sin, she is disposed, in the natural whirl of her thoughts, to break off the present subject." Hase: "She seeks by her question as to the religious differences between Samaria and Judah, to divert His penetrating inquisition into the abhorred relations of her life." Braune: "She at once, with great tact, diverted the conversation from herself, and turned it to the question of, etc." De Wette: "For she would, with the customary skill of woman, avoid an unpleasant disquisition."

evasion, we may take it for granted that her thoughts, after no slight pause during which the Lord's wonderful word would exert its operation upon her soul, would revert to the *Person* of Him who had spoken; for from the first τίς ἐστιν this must have been the leading idea of her mind, influencing all others,—Who and what is this man? "Yea, Lord, I *am* a sinful woman," is the solemn undertone of the avowal that Jesus was a prophet; and that she does not utter it outright, is "perfectly in harmony with the character of such a woman." It is confession enough that she does not contradict, especially in matters upon which *shame* would instantly arise to set a seal upon her lips. The whole previous conversation warrants her confidence that the Lord's design is not her utter condemnation, but that He will help her to the attainment of eternal life; and she equally well knew that it was not His purpose then to push the examination and inculpation further. What, then, is His immediate design? To bring her back to God, to transform her from a sinner to a true worshipper of God! This being so, reverence and the beginning obedience of faith would almost compel her to turn the subject whither her words actually led it. But it arises directly and spontaneously from her heart. "The question with her is confession of sin and forgiveness." (Luthardt.) The uncertainty of her soul as to the vain conversation of the past, and as to her hereditary religion (ver. 12), is the first fruit of her contrition and repentance;—and well for those who have only come so far as to ask with such earnestness as this woman now shows! Now she begins in very deed to *thirst* for the water of life! How often had she gone, thoughtlessly content, to the mountain of her fathers, joining in their προσκυνεῖν, notwithstanding all her sins, just as she drank of their well,—but this is past, all over at a single stroke! She marks the true difference. She is very far from encountering Him again with—Art Thou greater than our fathers? She begins to discern in this Jewish Prophet argument of the truth lying on the side of the Jews; their cause is justified in Him, and she is constrained to yield. Till now, her προσκυνεῖν, as she still speaks, had been a neuter verb without an accusative case; she knew not, nor reflected, what or who was concerned in it (ὃ οὐκ οἴδατε, ver. 22)—but now she begins to perceive that it signified the drawing water from the

fountain of God, the Holy Spirit. There is something of her ancient ignorance, indeed (and *here* lies the involuntary diversion), in the inquiry as to the *place;* she asks about the external *where* instead of the internal *how:* yet is she in this partly justified, as the Lord's subsequent declarations show; since in the first coming of salvation, all depends upon *whence* it comes, in what chosen and sanctified place His holy waters may by us be drawn.

This mountain is *Gerizim,* concerning which we can give only a few brief remarks—copious learned disquisition may be found elsewhere. The son of the high priest Joiada (Neh. xiii. 28), whom Josephus calls Manasseh, and whom Nehemiah had chased from him because of his marriage with a strange woman, was received into the protection of Sanballat, his father-in-law, the Persian deputy over Samaria, who also built for him in contempt of the Jews a temple upon this mountain (2 Macc. vi. 2). Alexander the Great (according to Josephus, though the statement and the chronology are contested) gave permission, by a decree and its confirmation, for the establishment of a high-priesthood in connection with it. When John Hyrcanus afterwards destroyed this temple, the Samaritans still regarded the mountain with veneration as the place of sacrifice and prayer in opposition to the claims of Jerusalem; and the most embittered enmity continued ever after between them and the Jews. In the passage of Moses, Deut. xxvii. 4, the one read Ebal, the other Gerizim, and alleged mutually against each other falsification: it is now sufficiently plain that the Samaritans were guilty of the corruption. They further appealed to the most ancient places of the Patriarch's sojourn lying in their country, as we have above seen. This latter fact the woman seems here to have in view in speaking of the fathers:—our fathers, that is, our *common* ancestors, Abraham and Jacob, worshipped on this mountain. Although this does not seem to be exclusively intended; the expression passes over into the more general signification—the ancients whom *we* follow. "And *ye* (already something of a frank confidence towards the Jewish Prophet) maintain, on the contrary (as it appears to my people, without foundation, against the custom of the fathers), that in Jerusalem is the place[1] or-

[1] Τόπος, הַמָּקוֹם, the term used in the law, concerning the unity of the

dained:—which of the two is right, and where shall I from this time turn?" This is the question which she designs to put, but St John does not expressly mention it: either for brevity, because it was self-understood, or more probably because the woman herself left it unfinished; being suddenly silent before the Lord's countenance, penetrated by a profounder feeling, and stirred by returning shame,—just at the moment when she was about to relapse into a more superficial tone,—to a deeper question than that concerning the place. The Lord gave her time to say all that she had to say, before He gave her His far-reaching and sublime reply.

Ver. 21. New and tumultuous thoughts began now to arise in the mind of this woman, excited as she was by the impulses of that good thing which now possessed her mind and soul. This was the question which she now prepared to propose, or which stirred in her heart:—Assuredly the Jews, who have the prophets, must be right in their Jerusalem, but must I therefore go over to them? Can I only thus obtain help?—In the midst of these unexpressed presentiments the Lord now apprehends her secret thought, and enchains her mind by His next words. First of all, He graciously responds to her confidential "*ye*" by His "*Believe Me!*" the only time recorded as thus falling from His lips. This condescending form of speech, however, here occupies the place of His "Verily I say unto thee!" since no prophet had ever thus introduced his utterances. It is not—believe *us*, that *we* worship in the right place! O no, the "Prophet" at once passes far beyond this, in a revelation for which this poor Samaritan woman was more susceptible than any one in Judea. The *time cometh*, or the hour, or the days,—the customary formula of prophetic announcement, which in St John's gospel we often find recurring in the Lord's mouth. *Neither* in this mountain, *nor* at Jerusalem; that is, obviously, the same as if He had said—*Both in one and the other.* For it is only the exclusiveness which is revoked, so that the δεῖ προσκυνεῖν shall no longer be bound to any particular τόπος.

place to be chosen for the service of God, Deut. xii. 5. No place was determined there by name, and the Samaritans adhered only to the Pentateuch. But that there *must* be a definite *place* was taken for granted by Jews and Samaritans alike, on Old Testament principles.

What an instructive contrast to that exacting zeal for the yet standing and yet acknowledged house of the Father, which the disciples might have expected, most assuredly in *Samaria*, when the question should arise! The Lord has indeed in view the great, and equally free prediction of Mal. i. 11 (בְּכָל־מָקוֹם), after which His word, proceeding from Gerizim and Jerusalem, stretches out to embrace the whole earth. *Ye* shall worship—that is, not merely the Samaritans,[1] but all mankind is before His view, all people after the exclusiveness of an external election is withdrawn. Thus does He break down the contention of the woman's *ye* and *we*, while He reconciles them in passing far beyond them both. Every one must feel that He could not intercommunicatively say—*We* Jews and Samaritans together, we of the human race; but it is necessary to press this again and again against all Rationalism, and ask how it comes to pass that He never thus spake, but everywhere when speaking of man's relation to God, maintained His own dignified distinction from all humanity. The same unity and separation of His own person lies also in that great word, quite new to the Samaritan woman—τῷ πατρί. He is the true Father, not father Jacob, ver. 12, or the fathers, ver. 20. (Which *tacita oppositio* Calvin also remarked.) Here for the first time the general expression is well-nigh equivalent to *My* father; but it then passes over into the wider meaning which is developed in ver. 23.

Ver. 22. When, and not until, His far-sweeping glance has gone forward to the demolition of the partition-walls of a preparatory dispensation, there follows that assertion of the priority of the Jews, with which every other but He would have rigorously begun! We must supply for the connection an interpolated and retrospective *truly* or *although;* since it is His intention to obviate all misunderstanding by giving the true decision upon the contested question. He cannot disguise it from the Samaritans, that they are Samaritans and living in the error of their own self-chosen deception, and that their worship of God rests upon no sure foundation in the Divine choice and appointment. The

[1] Brücker, the respectable, though in many instances not very penetrating, editor of De Wette, maintains this against Baumgarten-Crusius; as if the Lord here specially predicted the conversion of the Samaritans! But the comprehensive "neither—nor" clearly decides against him.

προσκυνεῖτε ὃ οὐκ οἴδατε—inverted, alas, in Luther's translation—may indeed rightly be termed a *mos loquendi plane singularis*, and has given great trouble to expositors. As the Lord retained this expression as used in the woman's saying, in order to elevate it to its right meaning, He at first carries her indefinite *προσκυνεῖν* without an object a little further in the mere *dative τῷ πατρί* (twice, again in ver. 23), until he finally introduces the only correct and conformable manner of speaking in the twice-repeated *αὐτόν* of vers. 23, 24 (comp. Matt. iv. 10). Are we then to take *ὃ οὐκ οἴδατε* as the object of their prayer? As the neuter does not seem suitable for this, many have been disposed to understand it more generally: either as referring to the worship itself—ye worship as ignorant, since ye do not understand what the significance and meaning of *this your worship* is (*and exercise yourselves*, therefore, in what ye know not); or as instead of *καθ' ὅ*, in a manner, and with circumstances, which show that ye do not understand the right *how and where*. We do not think that this is a sufficient explanation of the paradoxical formula, which assuredly refers to the significant want of an object in the woman's words, and aims convincingly to detect this to her apprehension. The neuter then signifies to her that the living reference to a personal God, and the well-grounded consciousness of His acceptance, was wanting to their worship; and that, indeed, because they had failed, in their self-chosen place and ceremonial of prayer, to stand in the obedience of His hitherto-uttered will. It is then said all the more plainly concerning the Jews—*ὃν οἴδαμεν*, but only as continuing the previous formula by way of contrast.[1] The Lord here most impressively draws the character of every form of departure from the appointment and institution of God, which was pretypified in this Samaritan worship; of every since-existing lapse of the church through *ἐθελοθρησκεία*. It is the obscuration of all clear perception, of all sure consciousness concerning the way and manner which God Himself has shown and commanded, whence

[1] Luthardt gives the meaning otherwise, and perhaps better. "The neuter is used here of God, because it is not that the Samaritans, in contradistinction to the Jews, knew not God in and of Himself; but they knew not what *man may hope from Him*, namely, that He is a God of *Salvation*, a God of Redemption."

there must practically follow the ever-increasing darkness and emptiness of so-called worship; for the real blessing of the living God is withdrawn in punishment from the self-imagined mountain of blessing to which these self-willed worshippers pertinaciously repair. All Heathenism itself is on a parallel with this apostate Samaritanism. But, again, this extends, as does the gentle word which immediately follows (reminding us of ver. 10), to the individual who is involved in such apostasy as a sort of excuse, in as far as the *προσκυνεῖν* which yet remains in him intends and seeks, in the sincerity of a sense of need, the true God. (Hence in Acts xvii. 23, the *ἀγνοοῦντες*, and in ver. 30 the *ἄγνοια* winked at.)

Previously, when contemplating the New Testament futurity, the Redeemer, who as the Son come in the flesh, revealeth the Father, necessarily preserved the distinction between Himself and mankind, and could only say *Ye;* but now when He speaks as sprung from the Jews, as their Representative, maintaining their rights, and fulfilling the promises made to the chosen Israel, it is befitting that He should say *We.* All this is explained and consummated in the last *Ἐγώ εἰμι*, ver. 26. It is not appropriate to regard this *ἡμεῖς* (with Semler and Henke), as embracing the Lord and His disciples, being the only present true worshippers; for the position laid down immediately afterwards in proof mentions the *Jews. Such* a special collocation of Himself and His disciples would be unseemly, while the avowal retained its deep truth as it regards the people of God, from whom He sprang, and whose essential heart He Himself only was. Let it be observed here, how the Lord, who well knew to reprove and correct the apostasy and blindness of Israel when standing in their midst, nevertheless to those without makes Himself their representative, as far as they were the elect people of God, and entrusted with the treasures of His revelation! In this *ὁ οἴδαμεν* the Lord acknowledges all the truth of the orthodox doctrine which might lie in any Pharisaic *οἴδαμεν.* Having then the genuine prophetic word, from which every one who would *might* have learned and known the truth; and their temple having been really consecrated by the glory of God, having been in truth the Father's house during all the ages of preparation; so much greater was their guilt in going no

further than an empty, blind, and proud "saying, that *this* is the place" in enmity to all Samaritans and Gentiles.

The ὅτι which follows is assuredly, as Baumgarten-Crusius rightly remarks, not simply a consequence (therefore can the Messiah only come from among these who know aright, who abide in the true sphere of revelation), but the *cause* of their better knowledge. *Salvation*, here an abundantly pregnant expression, equivalent to the salvation of God among the prophets (let the appeal of the dying Jacob be brought to mind, Gen. xlix. 18, which in the deepest sense refers back to ver. 10); thus it is, even as the Samaritans afterwards, ver. 42, rightly term Him ὁ σωτήρ, the manifestation of the promised *Messiah*, who testified of Himself even as the prophets had done, that He would bring in the powers of the Father's universal worship. *This* is the *understanding-point* of the Old Testament in which the Samaritans were wanting, for they held not the prophecy which came after Moses. Only those who *have Moses and the prophets* attain unto it; they only know the true foundation of worship, the aim and the spirit of the service of God. The idea itself, to which the Lord here gives utterance, is already found most clearly and simply expressed in Ps. cx. 2, l. 2; Isa. ii. 3. Oh that all to whom in our day the offence of Judaism is almost, as it was to Celsus and Julian, become the offence of the Cross, would humbly hearken to this one great Jew, who, while so spiritually asserting the worship of all nations in spirit and in truth, yet stedfastly maintains the Divine appointment of this Jewish people, as the issuing-point of this salvation for the entire world![1] Would they but learn to bow down before this ἐκ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἐστίν, which the great *fact*, immediately proceeding from the Divine counsel, and incontrovertibly fulfilled for now eighteen hundred years, attests.[2] This ἐστίν in the present,

[1] Dieffenbach and Schulthess, indeed, would have the entire ver. 22 to be an interpolation which disturbs the connection—this, however, is nothing but the mischievous folly of a so-called criticism. Bahrdt has delivered himself from the obnoxious verse in another fashion, and thus expounds—*We* Jews know *now*, that God is the *Father*, since Providence has brought it to light by Me!

[2] God's will is so firmly fixed to assert His election of the fathers, that yet once again in the coming futurity the full salvation of the Gentiles will proceed from the Jews. Rom. xi. 12, 15; Zech. viii. 23.

announced to the Samaritan woman the then beginning commencement; in order to obviate the ὅταν ἔλθῃ of ver. 25, and to prepare the way for the immediately following καὶ νῦν ἐστίν.

Ver 23. After this careful distinction between the rights of the Jews and the Samaritans (which, however, was nothing "transitory," but altogether an essential point), the discourse goes back to ver. 21, more plainly expounds the "neither—nor," and turns, with the revelation of the coming, or rather already come, salvation, to the true worship of the future age. Thou, a woman of Samaria, needest not to go to Jerusalem, for behold the new time is opening through Me, with whom thou now speakest. The open vision does not merely extend wider and further, but pierces ever deeper also; the veil of shadows falls away, the sanctuary and reality of the New Covenant is opened. The true people of God are gathered from all nations;—those, namely, who are the ἀληθινοὶ προσκυνηταί, the true and genuine worshippers; according to the requirement of the word, now first finding its complete meaning, the *Father*-worshippers, for such is the character in which the Father will be sought by those who are προσκυνοῦντας αὐτόν. This repeated αὐτόν must receive the strongest emphasis, as it now takes the place of the indefinite ὅ; and then it is that real and consummate worship which receives its perfect expression in the closing words of ver. 24, where all is included that was lacking in ver. 20. Τῷ πατρί—*now* designates the common Father of these προσκυνηταί, equally near to all who worship Him, in the freedom of His spirit and of His truth; but this is something very different from the rationalist "universal Father" of Nature, and without any qualification. That God is our Father, rests here, as in the whole New Testament, upon a presupposed new birth through faith in Him, whose Father He is in the only proper and essential sense. Thus before Christ came, faith in Him as coming, faith obscure in its perception, but the same in heartfelt experience, and exciting the yearning for a future fully revealed salvation, was the kernel and spirit of all genuine worship; in proportion as this was found in any sincere worshipper, was his worship that of πνεῦμα καὶ ἀλήθεια, the anticipating presentiment, if not the full knowledge, of the Father. When the Son

now comes and reveals the *name* of the Father, all who are sincere fall down—sooner or later—before Him, to receive out of His newly-opened fulness. All others show by their unbelief that they are not, and never were, *προσκυνηταί.*

In spirit and in truth! In order to seize the meaning, in any approximate sense, of this amazing and inexhaustible expression,[1] which admits not of easy paraphrase in any dry form of words, we must of course set out with the antithesis to the Samaritan, and even Jewish *προσκυνεῖν* in any one particular *τόπος*, which is first of all indicated. That *προσκυνεῖν* considered God as having a limited dwelling-place (but see, on the other hand, at the consecration of the Temple, 1 Kings viii. 27, and in the prophets also, Isa. lxvi. 1, 2), and, according to the fundamental meaning of the word itself, was limited to a mere הִשְׁתַּחֲוָיוֹת, a bowing down, prostration, and offering of certain ceremonies. Consequently, *ἐν πνεύματι* is, first of all, *internally;* see the prayer of Manasseh, ver. 11. But the two-fold expression must not be resolved with Storr by a *ἕν διὰ δυοῖν* into *ἐν πνεύματι ἀληθινῷ*, that is, *ἐν ἀληθινῇ καρδίᾳ*, Heb. x. 22, according to which it would amount after all to no more than the Mosaic *ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ καρδίᾳ σου.* But at the very first the profounder idea arises—that the worship must be offered in the inner being of man's God-related spirit; comp. Rom. i. 9. And *from that follows* the *ἐν ἀληθείᾳ* which in itself is deeply significant. He only who approaches God in his inmost being, and from his inmost spirit offers Him acknowledgment, prayer, supplication, praise, and thanksgiving, worships Him *sincerely and in truth* (*ἀληθινοί* has already hinted at this)—see Ps. cxlv. 18 בֶּאֱמֶת Sept. *ἐν ἀληθείᾳ*, for which Luther has translated correctly *with earnestness.* For it is only in the spirit that there can be the earnestness and the truth of a being corresponsive to the Supreme. At this stage of our comprehension we may safely paraphrase the formula by *πνευματικῶς καὶ ἀληθῶς, inwardly and sincerely;* and this gives us a necessary protest against every system of *mere ἔθος*, and the *ψεῦδος* which invariably

[1] So little understood by some of the fathers, that they did not even retain the *unity* of the whole, but gave *ἕν πνεύματι* to the Jews, *ἐν ἀλήθειᾳ* to the Samaritans.

lurks in it. This is manifestly here, at ver. 23, the first and most obvious meaning;[1] a wider and deeper one will be opened up in the repetition of ver. 24, which gives the foundation and reason of the whole.

Such does the Father seek to worship Him. To translate, however, this ζητεῖ (with Luther's "*will haben*"), as if it simply meant that God requires, and according to His essential nature will tolerate no other worship than this,—is too definitely to anticipate the words which follow. It does, indeed, involve a preparatory transition to the final δεῖ of ver. 24; but here there is evident reference to a direct, and self-manifesting *search* after such worshippers, and our German Bible lets slip a point of critical moment in not literally preserving the expression of this. For the καί obviously points to that meaning, constraining us to put the question—Who then seeks *as well as the Father?*[2] Who but He that is now speaking, and who thus gently announces Himself to her as the Sent of God, yea, as the *Son of this Father* in the essential equality of nature and of operation. The whole conversation had, indeed, more and more powerfully excited the conviction in the soul of the woman—This marvellous man, this man of God, this prophet *is seeking me*, is seizing my inmost conscience and heart, *for God!* To this conviction the Lord now attaches His word—Even as I, in the name of *the* Father, first *Mine*, and then through Me thy Father also, am seeking thee now.[3] But what the great *God seeks* first and foremost among men,—Samaritans even, *worshipping* after their manner, and Jews going up to worship at Jerusalem—is but seldom and not at once to be found; and this is the further sig-

[1] Lampe cites the strikingly analogous words of the heathen Cato: Si Deus est animus, nobis ut carmina dicunt, hic tibi præcipue sit purâ mente colendus.

[2] My critic Münchmeyer thinks it more simple to understand that the Father *seeks*, requires us to do this—as if καί were to be construed with ζητεῖ. But then the two words would be more closely connected; in the text the καί, preceding as it does, has evidently a peculiar emphasis.

[3] Roos, who indeed translates "not only I, but the Father also," adds too strongly, "without doubt the Samaritan woman felt, while He was speaking, that He who spoke was equal with the Father!" Yet there is something of truth in this as far as concerns the interpretation on the part of our Lord who thus confidently speaks of *the Father*.

nificance of His impressive saying. "The ἀληθινοὶ προσκυνηταί are at the present time but few, they must be sought out and brought to light and collected. This great work of God begins now through Me, and will go on gloriously in the days which have now begun: though even now the few whom He has found are far from being all."

Ver. 24. And now, finally, comes, thus prepared for, the last and conclusive word, in which πνεῦμα καὶ ἀλήθεια are seized in their yet profounder meaning, and placed upon their deep foundation. Such words and such sentences as this are never to be understood in their ample significance by that exegesis which refuses to recognise *the progressive unfolding of their fulness of meaning*, but insists upon always restricting the same expression to the same unalterable formula. It was assumed in the former passage, as the foundation of the Lord's declaration, that πνεῦμα γάρ ἐστιν ὁ ἄνθρωπος; thence, if man will pray ἀληθῶς, it can only be by his praying ἐν πνεύματι αὐτοῦ. But now the Lord's meaning reaches higher when He utters His sublime Πνεῦμα ὁ θεός[1]—before the absolute emphasis of which the γάρ which our thoughts would supply disappears and is lost. From that great position there arises a strict and peremptory δεῖ, which is set over against that external one in ver. 20. Herder says very aptly on this passage—"according to *His own* nature, the nature of prayer, and the nature of humanity, God can only have spiritual worshippers." And Joh. v. Müller as well—"Without the shadows of ceremony, without hypocritical observance of merely external things; a connection is established in worship analogous to their reciprocal nature."[2]

In chap. iii. 8 the most general and material fundamental idea of πνεῦμα was set out with, but now we have its most profound and final meaning at the opposite extreme, the keystone of all its other significations.—In Ackermann's Tabelle (Studien u. Kritiken 1839. 4) this πνεῦμα ὁ θεός is strangely absent after πνεῦμα θεοῦ, although the author very exhaustively discusses the whole in his treatise. And on this point we do well to begin with the

[1] The Lord, with this design in view, could not have gone on to say (as Roos well reminds us)—The *Father* is spirit.

[2] In the remarks of his brother Joh. Geor. at the close of his "Blicke in die Bibel" communicated by Kirchhofer.

negative side: God is an ἀσώματον and ἄμορφον, as was expressly declared by the prohibition of images in Israel, in opposition to all the gross idolatry of heathens generally, and all the refined idolatry of their philosophers. Hence no mere external προσκυνεῖν, as was said before, can correspond with His nature, and be acceptable to Him. But what is the positive meaning of this the profoundest word in human language, when it is used to express the nature of God? Invisibility (the consequence of incorporeity), omnipresence (that is, again, only illimitableness), even eternity (that is, the negation of time), like unity and unchangeableness, are themselves only negations and abstractions, and can carry us no further than the notorious nothing and void of a certain philosophy. In all our cognitions of faith we must set out *from ourselves*, from our own God-derived and God-related nature; and hence we protest against Ackermann's axiom—"Νοῦς is an anthropological, πνεῦμα a cosmical idea; that is, in the former is ruling *intelligence*, in the latter *energy*." Rather we think (though there is this much truth in it that it makes the energy of *life* come before and in the intellect), that it is nevertheless an *anthropological* idea, inasmuch as no idea of God is possible to us, which does not take its rise in ourselves His creatures and similitude. Assuredly our Lord's πνεῦμα ὁ θεός is *more* than Cicero's mens soluta et libera, than Seneca's mens universi, or even totius ratio—for all else that language means by πνεῦμα is here comprehended, by way of similitude, *according to its full completeness in man.*[1] We may simply say, for catechumens, that the German expression "*ein* geist—a spirit" does not befit the idea, but is rather misleading; inasmuch as, taken in its plain sense, it would class God among spirits, just as we say—a man, an angel, an animal. Thus it is otherwise than as creatures are spirits that we are to understand it[2]—God is, in His single, incomparable being, absolute, perfect, the only pure Spirit, that is, energy, life, understanding, will,

[1] Lutz says correctly (Bibl. Dogmatik S. 45) first—"We must proceed from man in defining the nature of God"—but he presses and restricts (S. 46) this rather critically as it regards πνεῦμα, and reckons this also among customary anthropomorphisms. The case is not thus.

[2] Compare the early work ascribed to Novatian, de Trinitate, in Kahnis, Lehre vom heil. Geist. i. 307.

and activity.[1] *Energy*, the impulse which can move another object from a principle in itself, is the lowest and most general analogon in nature, and points already to an original almightiness; it then manifests itself still higher in organic nature as *life;* as *understanding* life in man, to whom, therefore, is ascribed *spirit* in a limited sense; life conscious of the I and the Not-I; and from this result the will and the action. Thus God is in the highest sense *living* in and of Himself; the principle of all *other life*, unlimited in knowledge and unrestricted in will, to which all limited analogies point. It is only by contemplating our own spirit (Eccles. xii. 7) that we can in any degree discern what that means—God is altogether and only pure Spirit.[2]

And now for the consequence from all this? Those who

[1] As we have given the gradation in our catechism, Fr. 162 (in the shorter Leitfaden Fr. 34).

[2] R. Rothe in the beginning of his theolog. Ethik has Scripturally shown how, in the idea "spirit," the absolute self-demonstration and self-sufficiency of God finds its highest expression, and thus that our πνεῦμα ὁ θεός is only the nearest explication of that first ground-formula of all speculation אֶהְיֶה אֲשֶׁר אֶהְיֶה. But we prefer, instead of the lonely methods of speculation, to advance upwards by the idea of "being, energy, life, perception," with reference to the corresponding stages in the universe which images God forth (existence, matter, organism, I); and, far from all obscurity of absolute thought and conception concerning God's being, to remain humbly content with the consciousness of our dependence upon creaturely images in all our perception and definition of God. To this Jesus points by His πνεῦμα (as Moses in the beginning by his רוּחַ אֱלֹהִים), that fundamental and wonderful word of human language, which embraces in one the first perception of an invisible, incomprehensible, and yet energizing presence which yet clings to material ideas, and the absolute feeling of a God which is in the ground of our own being. God breathes upon us, as generally in all *naturâ creatâ* the *natura creans* demonstrates its energy (the ἄϊδιος δύναμις καὶ θειότης), and then the most internal self-consciousness in our own soul is also only a breath of God Himself. In this πνεῦμα there is thus the absolute substantiality (corporeity) which lies at the foundation of all cosmical reality, as the absolute ideality which is postulated in all thinking. This πνεῦμα embraces actually "being, nature, and personality," and that with an ἐστίν independently of, above and before all ἐγένετο of creation; so that we have nothing to do with that abhorred and incomprehensible phantom to which the universal spirit of Hegel has been likened.

really are προσκυνοῦντες αὐτόν can worship Him in a manner worthy of Himself only when they acknowledge and perceive Him to be Spirit. By this we are driven in to the centre of our being, where His omnipresent energy, nearness, and influence, are felt and experienced. He dwelleth in us, who live and move and have our being in Him, even in our fallen nature; full and perfect worship can consist alone in recovering this truth, in the abolition of that sin which opposes it and estranges the soul from the life of God, in reinstating the indwelling of God in us, so that our πνεῦμα shall only know itself and live in the πνεύματι θεῷ. Augustine has incomparably expressed this, so that no expositor should omit to quote his words: Foras ieramus, intro missi sumus. Intus age totum. Et si forte quæris aliquem locum altum, aliquem locum sanctum, intus exhibe te templum Deo. In templo vis orare, in te ora. Sed prius esto templum Dei, quia ille in templo suo exaudiet orantem. This is the Holiest of all, here must the veil be rent.

The spirituality of God was assuredly the fundamental principle of the Old-Testament revelation, the ground-truth which not seldom has direct expression (comp. upon this Hofmann Schriftbeweis i. 66 ff.); but this truth earnestly maintained against heathenism is yet bound up with externality, and in some sense concealed; not until the veil was done away was it revealed in all its immediate fulness and simplicity. Neander's words, written in the spirit of Augustine's, no less forcibly and with equally classic precision expressing the spirit of the entire Scripture, are as follows—"*Man is not born* as a temple of God, *nor can he make himself* one, but can only be restored to that eminence *by the Spirit, whom the Son of God communicates to his soul.*"[1] Luthardt also most truly says: Spirit, this objective, real element, in which the praying man moves, is described as new; consequently it is not the human spirit of itself, the Divine in man, but the Spirit which proceeded first from

[1] The same Neander says again: "We must have recognised the personal God as Spirit, as He hath revealed Himself in Christ, and have entered into the fellowship of Christ's all-pervading reverence of God in spirit and in truth, in order to be able to worship Him aright." (Deutsche Zeitsch. 1850. S. 203.) This is, indeed, not so clear and expressive as the above extract.

Jesus. Thus does the Lord here finally refer to that *need*, to which He in the beginning promised His *gift;* and the πνεῦμα, in which alone we should, and in which alone we can, pray, stands in the same opposition to *our* σάρξ as in ch. iii. A new birth is required, of God the Spirit; only as His *children* can we worship the *Father* ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ. (Jude ver. 20; Eph. vi. 17, 18.) As the ὁ θεὸς ἀγάπη ἐστίν (the correlative of the Lord's words to the Samaritan woman) presupposes that loving can proceed and have its beginning only from Him, not from ourselves; even so can the *Spirit* which makes the *truth* of our worship come to us only from God. Thus the beginning and the end of the conversation with Nicodemus are here combined once more. God again communicates Himself to men sunken through sin into flesh; because He is Spirit, He can do this, and because He is love, He will. "If they are Spirit born of the Spirit, then do they the truth; and hence can they worship their God in spirit and in truth." (Von Gerlach.)

See then, how philosophy, with its empty, lying babbling about spirit, must submit to be put to shame before the truth as the Spirit of God imparts it; see it here plainly revealed that humanity must have a Son of God in heaven, if humanity would return to God again! The simple and edifying Gössner says: "Let men spiritualise their theology a hundred fold, let them refine their religion to the highest point, and put away every shadow of an image of God, let their worship be conceived as ever so intensely spiritual, after all there is no *spirit* to be derived from human nature, and in all the most spiritual service of God all would remain flesh notwithstanding. The only means of obtaining that spirit was—God became flesh, and whosoever is united to Him, becomes with Him one Spirit." Yea, verily; without the gift of a new life, which now in the fulness of time He who was made flesh hath brought to us—He who not only testifies of the Spirit, but purposes to bestow Him—this cheerless δεῖ must ever stand for the repulsion and despair of all προσκυνηταί, who will never find, either in their own independent *thinking*, or by *going* to any Gerizim or even *Jerusalem*, that ἀλήθεια of προσκυνεῖν which will realise all their longing aspirations or fulfil all the promises made to man. The Nicodemuses tarry without, like the women of Samaria, until He,

who has come to unite both in one, shall open to them the door, and remove the veil.[1]

His gift to us is πνεῦμα for the reawakening of our πνεῦμα; not merely *in order* to the ἀλήθεια of our worship,—it is also itself at the same time the ἀλήθεια, the reality of our worship of the Father. The ἐν ἀληθείᾳ in connection with ἐν πνεύματι referred in the deepest sense to the spirit in us as connected with the soul; for the spirit is one with the soul and pervades it throughout; that constitutes the truth of the whole man in his act. ("Spirit and truth are as much as spirit and sense: they are only distinguished by internal notes" Oetinger's Wörterb.). We thus reach the deep and full contrast with all that was before and independent of Christ, all that appertained to the old economy, and all that belonged to heathenism, in worship; that is, preserving the dichotomy of the expression, with all that is merely *rite* as well as all that in the rite is *type*.[2] Πνεῦμα is opposed to the external, sensible, bodily rite; the ἀλήθεια of fulfilment to the prophetic, preparatory type which stimulates anticipation of the reality and dimly points forward to it. (Comp. John i. 17.) Lücke's antithesis—ἐν σαρκὶ καὶ σκιᾷ meets the case precisely; since every restricted and limited service of God in the Old Testament, apart from the kernel of spirit preformed within it,[3] falls back in its externality and transitoriness into σάρξ;—upon this let the Epistle to the Hebrews be well studied, and compare Phil. iii. 3 with our text. And wonderfully does the theme yet further change its application:—the fleshly and bodily form appears as the empty shadow, and that which is spirit becomes the true σῶμα of that shadow.

[1] So also our speculatives remain without and worship, instead of the true ὁ ὤν, whom their thinking cannot find out, only an ὄν, ὃ οὐκ οἴδασι. An impersonal "*das* Gott"—as Jacobi says, and Jul. Müller quotes him; an original principle, into which they sink and lose themselves, and become nothing, instead of abiding for ever in His presence, worshipping before His *face*. O that they would humble themselves to the way marked out—Salvation is *of the Jews!*

[2] Nonnus: οὐκέτι μύστιδι τέχνῃ, with significance, and further: μιμηλὴν τελέοντες ἀληθέος εἰκόνα μύθου.

[3] "All sensible worship, even that which God Himself has appointed, is but typical, and only reaches its full truth and meaning in spiritual worship: without this it is no other than false." V. Gerlach.

For it is to be understood that the service of God does not, through its spirituality and inwardness, reject all externality, all material, bodily presentation of worship, and transform the New Testament congregation into a meeting of Quakers, where spirits wait for the Spirit, or into that worse than Quakerism, where the influences of the Spirit are never even uttered at all. "The very nature of man imperatively demands that in all this the *body* should be used"—says Roos. And what is still more emphatic—let us once more impress it upon our minds—it is He who was made flesh that possesses and imparts the Spirit. From Him, and in Him is reproduced for the Spirit in the church the sanctified body of worship, filled with the truth, in which the creating Spirit, according to His nature, ever strives to invest Himself, and clothe His operation. He alone who bows the knees of his heart, will first bow the knees of his body also aright; and this will penetrate everything external, so that all shall show itself to be, in deed and in truth, a *colere*, a *προσκυνεῖν* of the creature. While the solemn words of our Lord, with their rebuking, exhorting, promising *δεῖ* ever remain a standing corrective of the tendency, which we find even in the New Testament, to reduce worship to the *ψεῦδος* of a mere *ἔθος*.

Thus this superabundantly mystical statement—*πνεῦμα ὁ θεός*, (which Fichte declared to be *altogether useless* as a positive dogma, for the definition of the nature of God!) was not uttered to the *woman of Samaria*, with any design to direct her speculative perception;[1] yet it secures even to the speculatives the true and deep foundation for their principles, inasmuch as the conscience and awakening spirit of every man who seeks his God, and would worship Him aright, cannot be considered as being independent of his immediately living and practical understanding. The latter may be securely attributed to the former. For the Father seeketh *τοὺς προσκυνοῦντας αὐτόν*, that is, all who worship Him, as *τοιούτους*; and is able, if they yield to be found, to make them such. Let us observe here the *hints* constantly thrown out, to attract, and guide, and secure the Samari-

[1] Neander: "In uttering this sublime truth to an uneducated woman of an ignorant people, Christ overturns the aristocracy of culture, and the one-sided intellectualism of the ancient world. It is from *life* that the highest must spring, and for all men alike."

tan's soul: Woman, believe *Me—the hour cometh*—it *now is*—the *Father* in heaven (whose fallen child every man's instinct feels himself to be) even He *seeketh* thee! And in effect He had found her. Allured onwards from that first κύριε, further and further, towards and into the mystery of the *person of Jesus*—how can we now regard her, when she refers again to the *Messiah*, as desiring to elude and escape from Him, the Prophet, who had announced the Father to her soul? We therefore regard *her* last word, which paves the immediate way for Christ's, notwithstanding its apparent digression and evasion, as no other than the most gently expressed question of her spontaneous presentiment—*Art Thou the Messiah Thyself?*

Her οἶδα involuntarily returns back to that first εἰ ᾔδεις which it almost echoes; thus giving to the whole a rounded conclusion. She now produces and exhibits all that she, in common with the Samaritans, knows of religious things,—the best that she had: that which had lain unseen and unused now wakens up to life. "His words had quickened the miserable germ of Samaritan Messiah-hope into life," Lange. It is as if she had said, "Lord, I understand not fully that which Thou now sayest: but Thou speakest of a future which is dawning; when a better and more immediate knowledge of God will be vouchsafed, in order to the true worship of God;—*this* I as a Samaritan can comprehend, for we also with you expect the Messiah." (For her ἡμῖν is now as comprehensive as in ver. 21, thus much has she already learned.) Her ἔρχεται, which has a future in its signification, seizes the Lord's ἔρχεται; in adding the ὅταν ἔλθῃ, which points to a near futurity, she gives involuntary expression to the influence of the Lord's καὶ νῦν ἐστιν. *All things*—that great far-reaching truth to which thou directest me, and all that I need in order to my apprehension of it—will the Messiah when He is come *tell us*:—just as Thou now tellest me, and as Thou almost appearest to me to be One who can tell me *all things*. (Matt. vii. 29.) This last lies in the background of her presentiment, and she cannot yet rise high enough to give it expression; she seems rather to "take refuge in *delay* from the stern necessity of an all-comprehending decision," but this final procrastinating evasion is almost without the slightest tincture of earnest evil. It is with her, generally speaking, as it was with Nicodemus;

the folly of the past will not allow the present right meaning to betray itself, but draws over it a veil worse than the reality. Thus we are to understand the ἀναγγελεῖ which she obtrudes instead of saying as she ought—δώσει ἡμῖν πνεῦμα καὶ ἀλήθειαν, τὴν δωρεὰν τοῦ θεοῦ.

Most assuredly she is not now for the first time passing over to the Jewish expectation of a Messiah, and admitting that she now believed in that which he and the Jews hoped for and taught; in that case the οἶδα would be inappropriate and untrue, she would have used πιστεύω instead of it; in that case the Lord could not have reckoned upon her ability to understand the σωτηρία; ver. 22, and ver. 42 would be quite incomprehensible. We know nothing certain concerning the Messiah-idea of the Samaritans in the time of Jesus (this history shows us very plainly that they possessed it in some way); but we may assume that with their pretensions to be the people of God, and with the Jews so near them, they would less and less restrict themselves to the revelations of their Pentateuch. With the same confused mixing up of truths here and there appropriated (which had been their fundamental character from the beginning) they would lay claim now to the *Messiah*, even as their forefathers did to the temple structure—His *name* and presentation generally were derived by them from the Jews, and then, if they wished to find any such warrant, they would inlay it into the promises of Moses. It is to be observed that the woman herself uses the expression Μεσσίας, which the Evangelist translates Χριστός; and does not, as Sepp very arbitrarily thinks, speak of the mere Samaritan Restorer (הַתֶּהָב), in which it was John who discerned the Jewish Messiah. As among the Jews the notion of the Prophet —as 1 Macc. iv. 46, xiv. 41 rightly interpreted show[1]—sometimes took precedence of that of the King, so that the people could use such language as we find in Jno. vi. 14, vii. 40 (comp. Matt. xvi. 14), so we find it quite natural here that the Samaritan woman also, at a time when she is speaking of her own future apprehension of the truth, should make prominent this ἀναγγέλλειν πάντα in the character of Him who was waited for.[2]

[1] See Bergquist—An idea Messiæ in Apoc. V. I. sit obvia. Lundæ 1826, pag. 30, 31.

[2] The *later*, much contested notions of the Samaritans about the Messiah,

Ver. 26. We know no reason whatever for supposing that the Lord hastened (as Bengel thinks) his revelation to the woman, before the arrival of the disciples; for the avowal of the men, ver. 42, was public enough, and the Lord could not have been very anxiously solicitous to conceal His ἐγώ εἰμι, and to prevent their hearing Him utter it with His own lips. We read in the ἐπὶ τούτῳ, ver. 27, first of all, thus much, that the disciples had already actually come at the *close of the conversation;* and not merely that the period of His being alone with the woman extended *so long*. We must accept, on the other hand, Bengel's other word, in the Harmony: "His first saying had a very general tone—Give me to drink! And the *seventh* was—I am *Christ!*" Nothing was more natural than that He should not *now* keep back, one instant longer, this declaration. The predicate must by a Hebraism be included in the εἰμί, as in the Hebrew conversely אֲנִי הוּא already contains the verb substantive in the אֲנִי. *I that speak unto thee*—thus does the Lord confirm with great condescension her expectation of the ἀναγγέλλειν, which in itself was quite correct:—thou hast well apprehended that I was engaged in one work of the Messiah.[1] This loving, devoted *seeking* of a well-nigh found soul, impels the Lord forward to the utterance of this open declaration "which He thus *almost for the first time* promulges to a poor, sin-laden woman." (Lange ii. 1, 234.) That which He forbade His disciples in a later time to declare, He now publishes without any prudential restraint, for He cannot deny and withhold Himself from her. There is some truth in the common remark that there was not so much danger of His being proclaimed king in

can have no value in connection with our history: they are decisive, however (as Gesenius maintained at last, see Baumgarten-Crusius) for the long continuance of such a tradition. And Deut. xviii. 15 must necessarily have made the notion of the *Prophet* in the Messiah prominent to the Samaritans. Luthardt, opposing my view, thinks this very uncertain; but I am convinced that just as the Samaritans lightly esteemed all other prophets, so their acknowledgment of Moses would all the more impress upon them the expectation of *the* Prophet in the highest and fullest sense. Compare my remarks in the second volume, on Matt. xxii. 31, 32.

[1] But if she could only discern the first work, the prophetic office of the Messiah, *we* can go further, and reflect—Yes, verily, He is the ἐξηγητὴς τοῦ θεοῦ the λόγος of the πνεῦμα.

Samaria, and therefore not so much necessity for obviating the enmity of His foes; but it ought not to be forgotten that the scandal of the report, which indeed was laid hold of in the end, —that He had proclaimed Himself Messiah in Sychar! might have been productive of much *worse* consequences. Suffice it, that the Lord now takes counsel of nothing but the simplicity of His love; He is intent only upon drawing the folds round a human soul that He has secured, so that He may not lose it again—*Ask* now and *take* the living water, expectation is needed no more! Remarkable contrast! The dignity of His Messiahship, which He does not proclaim in Jerusalem, He confidentially discloses to this poor Samaritan woman at the well. Most affecting earnest and prelude of that fast-approaching time of grace, in which He would cry to all people upon earth—*Behold Me! Behold Me!* (Isa. lxv. 1.)

ENIGMATICAL WORDS TO THE APOSTLES. THE HIGHER FOOD: THE SOWER'S LABOUR FOR THE REAPERS SENT FORTH, AND THEIR JOY TOGETHER.

(Ch. iv. 32–38.)

The disciples, who not till afterwards learned to estimate our Lord's freedom in attracting and recognising the oppressed female sex, marvel greatly now at His confidential intercourse—first, with a *woman* alone at a public well, contrary to all Rabbinical propriety;[1] then, with a Samaritan woman; and finally, in a conversation altogether spiritual. Did they hear and understand the last word and rejoinder concerning the *Messiah* (how impressively must this word alone have fallen upon their ears!)? I think *not;* their minds being preoccupied with thoughts of food, they hear not distinctly at once; the fact of the woman's being with the Lord had altogether confused their apprehension of the character of the conversation. Otherwise

[1] Ne multiplices colloquium cum fœminâ—Tract. Erubhin. fol. 53. 2. Ne colloquatur quis cum fœminâ in plateâ, imo ne cum propriâ quidem uxore—Joma fol. 204, 2.

St John would not have represented the general μετὰ γυναικὸς λαλεῖν as the ground of their surprise, and that they refrain from asking the unknown subject of the conversation. The ἐγώ εἰμι of itself might have told them more, but they go not beyond the mere λαλεῖν, as if they had caught just the *last* ὁ λαλῶν σοι.[1] But their accustomed reverence keeps back their curious questioning concerning the unaccustomed sight—What seekest thou of this woman? What talkest thou with her? Grotius: Quid ab *eo poscis?* Cibum an potum? This is their first thought; but then rises their still more wondering reference to the λαλεῖν; for His words had seemed to them the close of a longer and more inward conversation—Or dost Thou teach her aught? Baumgarten-Crusius, having ζήτησις ch. iii. 25 in his mind, connects μετ' αὐτῆς with ζητεῖς also, and apprehends that they were thinking of some possible dispute upon the national question; but in that case λάλεῖν would certainly not have been in the second member of the sentence; indeed, the idea of the disciples' thinking of a Jewish dispute with the best of Samaritan women, is in itself hard to conceive. It is better to say with Wesley, though in that there is an improbability, that no man asked *the woman* what she would have with the Lord at first, nor *the Lord* what He thereupon said to her. For the woman goes immediately away, when the disciples had been there but a very short time. The last word of the Lord did not induce her to depart, rather did it cause her to stand still in amazement; but now the confidential solitude is disturbed, the Jewish countenances are upon her, and she is thrown off the balance of her gentle self-possession. Her hasty departure is at first a flight; and then afterwards follows the narration of all; not, indeed, designed when she left, but occasioned by her meeting with others. We cannot, however, positively say with G. Müller, "that she forgets in her joy the object for which she had come;" but this at least we may say, that her leaving the waterpot, in the fervent impulse of her spirit moved by the Spirit, is somewhat analogous to our Lord's own forgetting to eat. She thus

[1] Καὶ ἐπὶ τούτῳ notes this critical moment, hence the Peschito has—בְּדָא מְמַלֵּל while *He was speaking*. The Lord did not break off abruptly because of the disciples, but the disciples did not hear anything intelligently.

commits the apparent folly of undertaking the task of coming and drawing, complained of before, for nothing. *Scarcely*, as Richter's Hausbibel says, as a sign that she was coming again; for that would require her to have matured her plan at once, and in the first confusion of her timidity. Least of all did she reckon that the Lord and His disciples might drink the water drawn therein when she had gone! All this is unreal; but it is quite natural to suppose that in her natural and remarkable frankness of manner she would go to the first and best *ἀνθρώποις* in the city, with invitations and solicitations telling them of that *ἄνθρωπος*, who declared Himself to be *ὁ Χριστος*. *Come, see!* That is her first word, as in ch. i. 39, 46. The well-known sinner needed not to specify to the people more particularly[1] the *πάντα ὅσα ἐποίησα* of her past life. "All that *ye* know—a stranger Jew without the city has told me all that ever I did! (For her conscience had heard all things disclosed in the disclosure of one). Come, *see;* that is, search into it, test, and experience, and *hear* like myself, whether this *man* be like other men, whether He be not what He declares Himself to be—the Messiah!" The spiritual impulse which could induce this notorious woman to make so honest a confession (in which, as ever, the commanding power of her *testimony*, ver. 39, lay, and the wonderful paradox that the Messiah should announce Himself here in Gerizim (which no Samaritan could *sincerely* expect), both concurred in impelling the people to follow *such* a woman to see *such* a man,—a man who could tell them all their sins, and yet make them so happy as they already *see* this woman to be. At an unseasonable hour, many probably hurrying from their mid-day meal, they go out and in no small numbers (*πολλοί*, ver. 36). The woman has not provoked their contradiction by too bold an assertion, but with all her emotion has only summoned them to see for themselves; only intimating that He Himself had told her all this, and that *she* was constrained to believe. It is doing her great injustice to make this an example—as Braune does, pointing his condemnation against it—of a false way to faith, as if she required the judgment of her fellow-

[1] Very properly says Schleiermacher: "We see in what good estimation she was held by the men of the city from this, that they immediately went out at a simple word of hers."

citizens to confirm her *supposition.* Oh no, there is no more supposition in her case, she *knows* that the Messiah is *come.* It is, on the one hand, a gratuitous requirement that she should instantly betake herself to the company of the women who followed Jesus; and, on the other, it is equally incorrect to say (with Braune on ver. 42), that "she herself appears to have been no longer troubled about Jesus in Sichem!" Oh no, the Δεῦτε, ver. 29, means to say—Come ye with me out of the city to Him! She herself assuredly comes again with the people, vers. 30, 40:—to think otherwise is unnatural, disturbs the whole narrative, the fruit of which is just the winning of the woman, and then through her means, of the others also. Scarcely has she received a small measure herself, when, like a female apostle, she begins to invite others also, publishing her own shame before all the people to the honour of the Lord! And here, as in all New-Testament preaching, the great essential point is His Person—He is Christ, the Saviour!

In the meanwhile a very unseasonable interjection of the disciples, offering their earthly bread, gave occasion to the Lord for a second conversation with *them;* which, as it perfectly suits his plan, the Evangelist cannot pass over. As he subjoined, previously, to the conversation with Nicodemus, an "explanatory appendix on the relation of Jesus to the Baptist," so here a parallel offers itself on *the relation of Jesus to His disciples.* Thus is the Lord most significantly placed, at the commencement of the Gospel, between His forerunner and His Apostles; according to a plan and purpose which the sacred narrator follows only in obedience to the development of the history itself, and springing directly from the facts which he related.[1]

Ver. 32. Though it said of the Lord Himself only that He rejected food, we may suppose that neither did He *drink* of the waterpot left there; hunger and thirst had gone from Him; and the body of the second Adam lived and was nourished by the refreshing of the Spirit in the performance of the will of God. But the disciples, to whom the buying in a Samaritan city

[1] And we adhere to this, without being led astray by Luthardt's contradiction, who denies to the deeply-significant conversation with the disciples anything like an "independent signification."

had been of itself distasteful, see with ever-increasing astonishment His neglect of the provision which they had brought. "Master, eat Thou—if only that we also may eat! Art Thou then not hungry, like ourselves?" And His sublime answer is ordered with deep precision; since He does not unconditionally repel the thought of this kind of eating (the time for it also came afterwards), but for the present, by His dignified Ἐγώ and a general ἔχω, discovers to them that He in this matter was altogether different from them, possessed of different feelings, and under different relations. His words sound marvellously like those of the angel in the Apocrypha, Tob. xii. 19—yet they are not uttered with the same meaning, but with a designed and exciting tone of *mystery*, which would prepare the way for a further disclosure. As in the case of the Samaritan woman, He provokes their attention by figure and striking contrast. Ἣν ὑμεῖς οὐκ οἴδατε—contains in it no blame; it does not reproach them because generally they knew nothing or had experienced nothing of that spiritual sustenance which also invigorates the body (for that would not have been the truth); nor does it impute to them the fault of not thinking upon it in His case, for how could they have attributed such influence to spiritual intercourse of the subject of which they had known nothing? But it is *graciously* spoken, like the former εἰ ἤδεις, and means—"Ah, that ye knew what sustains Me now, that ye knew *My meat*, for then would ye also forget the bread! Now, since ye know it not, I will tell you what it is." (Properly speaking, βρῶσις is rather the present *nourishment* for the time being; and βρῶμα the *food* itself, the means of that nourishment.) As the following words of our Lord point from the beginnings of God's work in the souls of men to its *consummation;* as it is the glance which he now throws into the *harvest* following the seed-time—the ground-thought of the following discourse—that satisfies His soul with *joy*, we must attribute to the οὐκ οἴδατε an undertone of meaning which the Schullehrerbibel of Brandt has well expressed—"This great end and aim was not yet recognised even by those who should be instruments in effecting it." Not sensual and fleshly-minded men generally are opposed to the Lord's Ἐγώ in this ὑμεῖς; but rather these labourers in the harvest themselves who were already called and sent, but knew so

little of the joy of seed-time and of harvest rejoicing in hope, that He must now reveal it to their minds.

Ver. 34. His transition to this takes its rise from His own Person, but He immediately connects with that the *work* also, in which they themselves should be His ministers and co-operators. The natural man must first receive the gift, the power, the food of the Spirit, *in order to* do the Divine will; the Son of God in humanity *hath* already *in* doing it the energy which goes forth in new and continuous works. For He alone can say in the fullest sense what in Ps. xl. 9, 10 was prophesied concerning Him.[1] His daily bread is, that the will of God should be done, His kingdom come, His name be hallowed. The repeated interlocution of the disciples—which, though they only venture to speak one to another, does not escape Him—hangs still upon this, that if He *had had food* (as if He had not said ἔχω only), there must have been some one, even if it were an angel,[2] who brought it to Him, hungry as He assuredly was—and it is to meet this that He proceeds to speak plainly. Olshausen remarks that the ἵνα cannot, in this passage, be taken τελικῶς; but we agree with Lücke in the critical distinction which he draws. "The sentence with ὅτι would say, that Jesus found His sustentation *in this*, in actually doing the will of God; the ἵνα includes the yet more subtle thought, that His sustentation consisted even in the *endeavour* to be ever doing the will of God." Only that we should seize the idea better by another word than the ordinary "endeavour." The fundamental thought is the joy which is experienced in doing with prospect of constantly doing, the looking forward from the beginning and at every step to the *consummation* of all labour: it is from this

[1] The new man in Christ Jesus participates through the new birth in this possession and invigoration of the Spirit, and that according to the measure of faith; to this point forward all celebrations of spiritual satisfaction in the Old Testament, and of a joy which is insensible to hunger and thirst. But in the application of the text to ourselves, we ought not to forget the sole prerogative which is arrogated for Christ's own person in vers. 32 and 34. This Steinmeyer's Predigt in the Beiträge zum Schriftverständniss i. 185—which with all its beauty, contains much that is artificial—seems to us to do.

[2] For it was in the highest degree improbable that an ἐπιδήμιος ἀνήρ out of the city (as Nonnus says) had brought Him food.

deep feeling that the ἵνα, *pointing onwards*, flows; and the Evangelist's fine feeling of its force retained it.[1] The preaching of the word was, in the Lord's first meaning, the will of the Father (Mark i. 38)—but from this time onwards His glance goes further; for to regard the "ποιεῖν and τελειοῦν as standing together without any express significance," is a very false exposition. We cannot so easily exhaust the profound contemplation and intuition which are contained in such large and pregnant words as these. As in chap. xvii. 4 the redeeming death is included in the work by a sublime prolepsis, so here the meaning stretches still further, inasmuch as the seedtime is here viewed as preparatory to the full and complete harvest at the distant end. We almost always find in the words of our Lord Jesus that the consciousness of what is to follow pervades His reference to that which is passing. He now terms His meat what he will presently term His joy, a joy which He will participate with His reapers; for He Himself, in His work of seeking, and calling, and sowing the seed, the first principles of the living word, already anticipates and rejoices in the joy of the future.[2] He thereby gives also an answer to the suppressed question of the disciples as to what He was saying to the woman —What other than that for which I am sent of the Father? And thus He inspires them with boldness to put further questions in the future about this definition of His work, and to expect to share it with Him. And thus, finally, He places Himself before them as a type and pattern of the true Missionary zeal, which always and everywhere is engaged upon that which will speed on the great work towards its glorious maturity.

Ver. 35. Luther's: saget ihr nicht *selbst?* say ye not *yourselves?* disturbs the sense, since the words do not simply involve a comparison, but a *contrast* also. The Lord has before His eyes

[1] Münchmeyer rejects this remark of mine, with allusion to the Winer philology; but he does not seem to understand it, and not seldom do subtilties and fine shades of meaning elude his perception.

[2] The Berlenb. Bibel is this time much too limited and narrow in its interpretation—"This then now is My meat, that I interrupt not the work of God in the soul of the Samaritan woman by My eating, for she will instantly return. My natural eating must give place, *till I am ready for it.* This great matter must be waited for and *completed*"

the χώρας between the well and the city; and this gives Him the comparison, prepared for by τελειώσω, between the work of God and that *husbandry* which requires the seed-time first before the harvest can be reaped. Besides this, the ordinary exposition from antiquity downward has assumed that the Samaritans were seen flocking towards the Lord: Ebrard allows this to be "not impossible;" but to us the μεταξύ seems to indicate too short a time, and St John does *not* connect ver. 40 immediately with the conversation, but seems to imply an interval during which the meal was partaken of at the well. We think[1] that *the disciples* see merely the fields recently sown, and far from being yet white unto the harvest; but *the Lord's* clear view goes beyond, and sees in anticipation the people whom the woman would bring with her. Then would the requirement—*lift up your eyes*, become another mysterious enigma, which would soon find *its* solution in His words. "*Behold*, I say unto you, I have now been sowing the word, and already behold a sudden harvest upspringing and ready—should not this be My meat and My joy?" We may regard the four months' waiting-time as very probably a *proverbial* expression, and that because of the λέγετε which introduces it; for in ver. 37 we have another λόγος quoted, and its correctness this time, and, as it were, in contradistinction, approved of. Proverbs generally are to be taken with a free interpretation, and the meaning of this proverb indicates the utmost possible shortening of the time, as it is used for the encouragement of the waiting sower. *Only* so much longer! The Lord goes beyond the proverb in the same direction, but with a different application. "Ye are accustomed to say—*in any case* only so long; but I assure you that the harvest in this instance (of that seed of *Mine to which I refer*) will instantly follow, as an encouraging type and earnest to you." It necessarily follows also from the unqualified ἔτι and ἤδη,[2] that it must have been then the actual seed-time, that is, according to our chronology, the beginning of January before the harvest of the winter-seed

[1] As de Wette with great propriety: "We must not assume, with Chrysostom and almost all expositors, that Jesus pointed to the Samaritans as they hastened towards Him. The harvest was not so very obviously near as this; but in the hope of prophetic contemplation."

[2] On the position of ἤδη at the close of verse 35, see Lücke.

in May. (Not, as Bengel thinks, that the Lord was speaking in Nisan, before the second or main harvest, absolutely so called.) Now the disciples saw no harvest-field; they said and they thought assuredly—There must at least be four months yet! But the Lord sets before them a mystery and an enigma, and thereby would teach them to lift up aright the eyes of their faith.[1]

That the presupposed saying of the disciples already referred to the sowing of the word, as Schleiermacher, and Hezel before him, thought, appears to us altogether out of the question. The disciples had not apprehended that one word, ver. 34, with such clearness and largeness of view, as to be capable of thinking—"But it will be long yet before any result will be seen from this day's announcement of the kingdom of God, or at least before any harvest will spring up among these Samaritan citizens!" All this was far from their eyes of sense, and therefore the Lord, when He bids them look in another meaning, raises them to a higher and spiritual contemplation. He alone sees in anticipation the harvest, not only the present typical and restricted one, but that great and universal *harvest* which He contemplated in it, which was now drawing near; that harvest, of the final consummation of which Ps. lxxii. 16 prophesies, where it stands thick upon the tops of all *mountains*, and the people of all *cities* flourish like grass of the earth; when apostate Samaria shall be brought back, and the salvation which goeth forth from Jerusalem shall return back to the same renewed Jerusalem; when in the rich plenitude of the blessing poured forth, the ploughman shall overtake the reaper, and the treader of grasses him that soweth seed, seed-time and harvest being blended in one. (Amos ix. 13.) It is His purpose to teach them "how great a difference there is between *the eye of faith* and the eye of common experience" in the great husbandry of God; to make them partakers of the joy of His hope, if they can only embrace it, for their consolation in their future apostleship. And so far it is as if He

[1] If this chronology must be given up as impossible (as Münchmeyer contends), then this *antithesis* of the spiritual harvest, and the harvest not yet near in the fields, as the essential ὀξύμωρον, would be disturbed. The longer continuance in Judea which I have assumed (see the tables in Vol. iii.), is justified throughout the whole harmony.

had said, for their *subsequent* understanding, in *prophetic* words —probably an allusion to Isa. xlix. 18, lx. 4—"look upon the lands, into which ye will be sent forth; could ye but behold them, as I do, *with the right eyes*, ye would see that they are already white unto the harvest." (Berlenb. Bib.) We also should receive the same words and apply them to all cases in which the proverb is applicable. They will teach us, on the one hand, to wait humbly and patiently; but they will teach us, on the other, to keep the joy of harvest in our view in the midst of the toil of sowing, for our invigoration and refreshment, that so we may be able to regard every exception of swiftly-ripening blessing as a promise and a type of full success.

Ver. 36. The second figure, to which the former paved the way, is at length altogether released from the present, and pursued as a pregnant similitude applicable to the whole period of man's labour in the kingdom of God. The Lord now looks beyond this preliminary and scanty harvest in Sichar, and contemplates in futurity all His harvest-men yet to come, whose representatives He beholds in these Apostles, and to whom He promises *joy*. Baumgarten-Crusius thinks that the three verses 36–38 should, strictly speaking, have followed each other in an inverted order; and as far as it regards mere logical sequence he is right. But the profound, prophetic words with yet higher propriety reverse the natural order; in order to go backward step by step deeper and deeper into the fundamental principle of the whole matter. The first great idea is the *reward* of the labourer; that is, obviously, not the meting out of recompense for work done in the ordinary sense, but the reaping itself is the reward appropriate to the previous sowing. Therefore he who himself has sown (and in the *figure* from which the Lord's words take their rise this is ordinarily the case) does not reckon it a toil to gather in his recompense. But in the second clause the words reach further, and indicate that He is *now* speaking only of the reapers in God's field. There it is far from true that every one who reaps has also sown; there he who reaps is not always the sower himself. Yet he who reaps *receiveth* as such what comes to his hand as prepared by Divine grace, not having himself made or procured it, and that is his first rejoicing. But then the higher joy is in his discerning the glorious design and

destination of this precious fruit—He gathereth fruit, into the kingdom and church of Christ, *unto eternal life*, for that great consummation of God's great mercy to man, the fellowship of His redeemed and glorified! For we cannot think the meaning to be—He labours and reaps *unto his own salvation;* the εἰς in connection with the συνάγειν is too significant for this. In the fruit-gathering of this world the produce is nourishment unto a πρόσκαιρος ζωή; in gathering souls it is unto *the true, eternal life.*[1] The perception and assurance of this is thus the reward of the labourer, his meat and his joy—so that we may regard the καί before συνάγει to be, as it were, a *vau exegeticum:* even in this he receiveth his wages. This is the answer to Peter's question, Matt. xix. 27; and a pregnant remembrancer in the spirit of the Apostles, 2 Tim. ii. 6. Oh that all our co-operation with the Lord's great work could bring us this rejoicing! It is *this* which is the greatest joy, that we are *not* gathering fruit *for ourselves*, but as ministers for the heaven of the One, great Lord of the harvest! It is *this*—as the Lord therefore proceeds to say—which unites the sower and the reaper in one common joy, all selfish contention being by this extinguished. "When we reflect that neither did the sower sow in his own land, nor the reaper reap his own fields, but that the field is the Lord's"—we add, and the issue pure blessedness with Him—"then all strife is destroyed." (Gossner.) Thus must it be through the whole period of our labour, in which endless sowing and reaping alternate; both kinds of labourers already rejoice *together*, for they are but one in effect;—he who soweth anticipates in unselfish hope the joy of the reaper who will follow, he who reapeth responds back to the sower's joy,—for all serve the One Lord, and all that they do is only His. And what rejoicing will that be when after the Pentecost feast of the first fruits (which the Lord had before His mind, as well in the figure as in his own meaning), the great feast of Tabernacles shall follow with the abundant and consummate gathering together of the completed harvest! (Ex. xxxiv. 22). Then will many a church be the joy and crown of rejoicing of many an Apostle (2 Thess. ii. 19) —but all only the participated *joy of the Lord*, who Himself in

[1] For this is the meaning, and not here simply—"into the garner of eternal life."

reality sowed the whole! It is to *this last thought* that the Lord now turns: for in these words, the thoughts of which are so marvellously and profoundly interwoven,—as they broke forth from the deep fulness of His ever-widening contemplation—He discloses progressively some new meaning in each saying as He utters it. "Rejoice together, however, *with Me*, the Sower, O ye My reapers; and forget ye also to eat!"

Vers. 37, 38. "For in *this* husbandry, the fruit of which is unto eternal life, and of which, as ye now mark, I speak, a second *proverb* is true, even as the former was untrue and inapplicable." We retain most confidently the reading *ὁ ἀληθινός*, and think, with Bengel, Winer, Meyer, Baumgarten-Crusius, that *ἐστίν* is the only predicate—*Here holds good*, and that in the loftiest and only sense of its deep truth, the common saying, which (as Olshausen well adds) "is true, indeed, in many other relations." Hic locum habet vox illa vera. The form of speech is precisely parallel with that of 2 Pet. ii. 22, *συμβέβηκε τὸ τῆς ἀληθοῦς παροιμίας*. Lücke's objection does not affect the question; for it might possibly be that *ἀληθινός* was used for *ἀληθής* (see afterwards on chap. vii. 28); and if it is sought to apply St John's ordinary meaning of the word in other cases, the sense would then be very emphatic:—"This word, which approves its truth in the various distribution of the labour of seed-time and harvest, maintains its truth in relation to Mine and My Father's kingdom in the highest and only proper sense, and it is therefore a *genuine* and *true* proverb, a similitude which penetrates to the very depth of truth, as all proverbs should do, but as they ofttimes do not."

What follows now gives us an explanation of this its highest meaning, that in which the Lord now uses it.[1] All is already involved in the *ἀπέστειλα*—"Thus shall it be in your *future apostolical office*, corresponding with your present calling." For the disciples had little or nothing to do directly with the harvest in Sichar; their Master was, so to speak, preparatorily, both

[1] This without prejudice to applications of other kinds, for every figure may bear various applications. Thus we find the sowing of man spoken of 1 Cor. iii. 7, 8, ix. 11. So in Matt. ix. 37, 38, the Apostles are *labourers;* and in Matt. xiii. 37, 39, *harvest* and *reapers* have quite another signification.

sower and reaper.[1] "*I have sent you*, as the Father hath sent Me," ver. 34—that is neither a mere prophetic future, nor an indefinite aorist (I *send* you). They were actually already called, and appointed to be, His future messengers; and they assuredly understood this well, although the name ἀπόστολοι (which here begins, as it were, to announce itself) had not been expressly given to them. But the goal of their mission lay in the future; and the Lord here tells them so, adding—"In this consists your ἀποστολή, that ye enter upon the harvest after the preparatory work, the *labour* distinctively and pre-eminently, has been already done.

That is a great and profound word. It may probably contain an allusion to Josh. xxiv. 13 (as Alford confidently maintains); but more certainly a general typological reference to the New Testament field of grace, as a land not sown of itself. Yea it might be said even to the Apostles, as the first labourers, "Lift up your eyes and lift up your hands—ye are already in the midst of a joyful harvest, instead of mourning over the sad toil of sowing for a far distant harvest." Who, in that case, are the ἄλλοι, who had laboured and sown before? The common exposition among the ancients, which has been represented by Grotius and Bengel, and defended by Lange,[2] makes answer: The Old Testament is here to be regarded as the seed; the New Testament, on the other hand, as the harvest. Many—such as Klee (and earlier Lampe) and Luthardt—are disposed even to class Jesus himself and the Baptist with the old prophets: this, which is thought to be the best view, is in reality the worst. We maintain with Baumgarten-Crusius, that to regard Moses

[1] Schleiermacher shows a lack of deep insight into the wide meaning of this prophetic word, when he thinks it necessary to assume that the Apostles were thus appointed to strengthen and confirm the beginning faith of the Samaritans, and to take an active part in securing the faith which had been excited in Sichar. Hezel imagines that the Lord imposed upon the Apostles the task of *baptizing the Samaritans!* But baptism cannot have any place here, for this would have been prematurely to place Samaria on a level with Israel.

[2] Ingeniously expanded thus: John, who had lighted up anew the hope of Messiah in Samaria, might have this consolation in his imprisonment; for that Divine seed sown in Samaria, the sower of which no man knew, which seemed to be lost and dead, now suddenly springs up.

and the Prophets as sowers, *would derange and disjoint the whole saying!* We may add that it is fundamentally and radically incorrect; for, the relation of the preparatory Old Testament dispensation to the grace and gift of Christ revealed in the last days, is essentially different from that between seed and fruit.[1] That would require, as Olshausen rightly says,—*καὶ ἡμεῖς εἰσελήλυθαμεν*—and we instantly resent the impropriety of such words put into our Lord's lips. But Olshausen's escape from the difficulty by making Christ the Lord of the harvest, and not included either with sowers or reapers, is still less tolerable. Is He not to be classed among them who utters His *Ἐγώ* here with such emphasis, who had just been speaking of His own *ἔργον*, and who elsewhere exhibits Himself as *κατ' ἐξοχὴν* the Sower?—Ever since I first read the Scriptures with opened eyes, and without ever having consulted any commentary, I have found Christ alone in the Sower of this passage; and I now find that such men as Herder, Tholuck, Lücke, Baumgarten-Crusius agree with me. The *ἄλλοι* is used simply to pursue the proverb (with the same humble concealment of the *ἐγώ* which we often find in connection with its strongest and most impressive prominence in reality); the contrast is set forth in the plural, just as for the same reason *ὁ θερίζων*, ver. 37, is in the singular. In the application, however, there is but one sower, the others all reaped; for it is He only who *sendeth* them all, and appointeth them their labour. Previously in ver. 36 the various sowers and reapers are embraced in one in the kingdom of God, but that is only the first application to what had preceded; the same relation is now interpreted more profoundly, though such progressive *deepening* of the same figure Lange very unjustly terms a *medley* of various figures.

Christ Himself and alone is in truth not only the sower, but

[1] I cannot retract this, notwithstanding Luthardt's express opposition, and must once more put it to him whether the general notion of "preparation" can possibly square with the profound conception here given of *seed* sown for a harvest. Even Sepp, though he does not forget to press the text into the service of his Catholicism—"The Mosaic economy is here represented as the school of Christianity, so that its priests are now merged in the priests of the new covenant"—yet abolishes his own exposition by his avowal—"yet that only *prepared the soil*, but Christ Himself was *the sower*."

also *the seed* which yieldeth much fruit, the glorious *corn of wheat*, ch. xii. 24—to which passage Tholuck very properly refers, and Schleiermacher also, led to it probably by the passion-season in which he was preaching. As the Lord had already included in τελειώσω, ver. 34, a prospective glance at His coming *passion*, the decisive crisis of His work; so now it is of deep significance that it is even this agony of preparatory labour—the bloody seed-time of the future great harvest—that is the object of His anticipating *joy*. Schleiermacher says correctly: "We may say, not only that He *was* sown, but, as He voluntarily gave up His life, that He *did* Himself sow Himself; and of Him only, in the fullest sense of the word, we may say that He *sowed*." How otherwise would the final *consummation* be His own, if all that we can do had not sprung from His perfect sacrifice of Himself? Yes, He alone had the great *labour* to achieve—the essential, and untransferable, and unmatched labour. Κόπος and ἔργον are closely connected together in this discourse, as end and beginning—as they often are. Here we have the preparatory work κατ' ἐξοχὴν, before which every other similar relation vanishes away. The more profoundly we carry back our investigations into the history of the spread of the Christian church, the more certainly are we convinced of a preparatory foundation of grace upon which every work has been built, and which alone has rendered it possible to be accomplished; and the ultimate foundation of all this grace is the one great gift of grace which Christ has sown in humanity. And here there is another and final antithesis in the figure: it would *seem* to be true conversely that it is ourselves who would have the labour of sowing, but assuredly there must have been fruit, harvest-recompense of the Lord's great sowing, in order that Apostles might be able to sow: the simplest prayer of a child—Thy kingdom come! is no less than the production of His Spirit. From the time that His work was accomplished, there has been nothing but increase of the joy; they have joyed before Him according to the joy in harvest, and as men rejoice when they divide the spoil, Isa. ix. 3. All this will manifestly come to an end at the great *rejoicing together* in eternal life. Before *this* transcendent sense of the words, which embraces in the Apostles all future reapers, and extends over the whole period of the

kingdom of God into the depths of eternity, that restricted application of them almost disappears—however true in itself—which refers the prophecy to *Samaria*, and that later and richer harvest in Acts viii.

Let us now glance over the whole, and dispose it in order. The subject of the testimony here uttered is the true gift of Christ to those whom He sends forth, or the *labour* of the Sower for His after-reapers, who will finally *rejoice* together with Him. This is pursued by two *figures* (meat—seed and harvest), and through three *antitheses.*

First: Christ's *meat* as the Sower, springing from the food which had been offered Him, and which he instantly turns to a figure. This leads to the enigmatical, and awakening contrast or *antithesis* of ver. 32. Then the explanation, ver. 34, which thus paves the way for what follows:—This meat is My *joy*, to sow for an eternal harvest—now the word, hereafter My life itself. Rejoice *ye* (My companions in this work) with Me!

Secondly: The joy of those whom He sends with Himself, as the joy of *the reapers with the sower:* with the wider glance over the fields, which present an image as well as an *antithesis* of the great reality. Transitional starting-point, which has the *immediate present*, the coming Samaritans, only in the foreground: Lift up your eyes *aright*, it is other than it seems! ver. 35. Then the solution of the mystery in that *universal* glance over the whole futurity visible to His eye—So shall *every* reaper one day rejoice with the Sower! ver. 36—and that holds good in the highest sense between Me and you, vers. 37, 38 (third antithesis with the sowing-labour of His sent Apostles, which though it is real labour, yet turns into no other than the joy of harvest!)

THE TWO SAYINGS TO THE NOBLEMAN. THE DESIRE FOR SIGNS AND WONDERS BLAMED. ASSURANCE, NEVERTHELESS, OF THE MIRACLE WROUGHT.

(Jno. iv. 48, 50.)

The section of the Gospel which begins at chap. ii. 23, finds its appropriate general close when the faith of the Samaritans is exhibited as an example of true *faith*, in contrast with that of those who believed at Jerusalem on account of the miracles. This brings out a point of view in which Nicodemus (chap. iii. 2) and the Samaritan woman are opposed one to the other. The preparatory faith *on the testimony of another*[1] is somewhat nobler and more spiritual, it leads immediately to the Lord Himself; hence St John, ch. iv. 39, anticipates *εἰς αὐτόν* as the result, and describes emphatically the *μαρτυρεῖν* of the woman, just as in ch. i. 7, 15. These put faith in a sinful woman, the Jews believe not even the Baptist! That faith in the word of man as such (first, ver. 39, *λόγος*, but then recurring as *λαλιά*, before the *λόγος αὐτοῦ*, vers. 41, 42) could only exist for the interim; and in 1 Kings x. 7 we find a certain wholesome impulse of unbelief derived from it.[2] The first fruit of it was the coming to Jesus Himself, to whom the testimony pointed; then follows, in the case of these sincere Samaritans (who appear, like guileless Nathanael, Israelites indeed) the true *experimental faith* in the *Saviour of the world*. This object of faith they did not so much derive from their books of Moses (Gen. xlix. 10, according to Grotius), as from the words of Jesus to themselves which are not recorded. The addition *ὁ Χριστός* is to be rejected from the text, according to Lachmann and Tischendorff:

[1] As St Augustine very justly laid claim to Jno. iv. 39, 42, on behalf of instruction from *authority*.

[2] Thus much is true of the distinction between *λαλιά* and *λόγος*. But Braune certainly goes too far when he understands the former as a word of depreciation, as if the woman's words were described as talk without connection, mere gossip! For they confess themselves to have *believed* her words, which is very different from disregard. The woman "disappears from the evangelical history," but only as all other subordinate persons disappear. Her conversion is not thereby denied.

the Samaritans did not utter this word at once, although the woman's testimony had included it. The Lord Himself had given them his own greater and deeper ἐγώ εἰμι, reserving, however, the actual name of Messiah.

Another, and a new section follows in the Gospel, extending to the close of the sixth chapter. Jesus as the Son, who is equal with the Father, is Himself life, and gives life to all who believe on Him! This is testified by three miracles, and their accompanying discourses. In connection with the first (and building immediately upon the foundation already laid) the mere desire of seeing wonders, in opposition to the heartfelt impulse of need, and missing the real purpose of the *signs* which flows from that sense of need, is strongly condemned. In relation to the second miracle, the Lord Himself interprets the *miracle* as a *sign*, announces the spiritual *quickening* influence of the Son in the unity and likeness of the Father, and refers to the *testimony of His works* to this in unison with other *testimonies* in themselves amply sufficient to faith. With the third miracle, finally, the seeking of mere wonders (misunderstood signs!) is sharply contrasted with the *inward need of man's heart, and its satisfaction in Christ;* testified in the declaration that He is the *bread* of life, which the Father gives to the world from heaven.[1]

Thus much we may at least premise for this general glance, which will shed its confirming light upon the exposition of the individual discourses. Jesus came once more out of Judea, where He had performed the miracles at the feast, into *Galilee*, where He had changed the water into wine at Cana. The Galilæans who had *seen* what, scarcely a year ago, He had done, receive Him with hospitality and with some sort of faith: this gives the point of view in which the Evangelist places what follows, the contrast, namely, between the Galilæan faith through miracles and the Samaritan faith of the heart. In *Cana*, where the Lord probably visited the wedded pair, He might be supposed to gather the harvest of the seed sown, but it is a very limited one. There comes to him a man, who painfully repre-

[1] We do not give up this self-justifying arrangement on account of Luthardt's, according to which ch. iv. should close the first great section, and our carrying on the last narrative to the following appears an entire misapprehension—but we will not earnestly dispute about this.

sents to him the Galilæan generally, and in addition to that, the man of eminence, the Herodian. Βασιλικός, in the most common signification and its usage in Josephus, is a royal official (Syr. עבד מלכא), in all probability of Herod who was styled Βασιλεύς.[1] He has a son, probably his only heir (Bengel—ut articulus videtur inferre), whose malady, according to all appearance unto death, drives him to the miracle-worker whose presence in Cana had come to his ears. This is assuredly a germ of faith, though a very unsatisfactory one; and now we perceive how the wisdom and the love of our Lord aid this man to the attainment of a true and perfect faith. We read *two words* addressed to him: first, the *preparatory word of instruction*, on account of which St John records the incident; then the *accomplishing, miraculous word of power.*

Ver. 48. The Lord now, as ever, responds to the inward disposition of mind which He instantly penetrated; and, as often happened, under the appearance of severity in reality made the applicant susceptible of much better things than he came to desire. We need not estimate von Gerlach's question whether the Lord was not now justified, after a longer manifestation of His power, in seeking and requiring a purer faith as the fruit of the signs which he had wrought; for, however applicable this might be in general, it would scarcely apply to this courtier, who must be supposed to have been a stranger to our Lord's wonderful works. The most immediate ground of His reply must be sought, as His words indicate, in the sad perception He had of the difference between these Jews, especially Galilæans, and the Samaritans from whom he had just come.[2] To these latter the one σημεῖον of the word of a prophet disclosing the secrets of their heart and life had been enough; but in Galilee there must be τέρατα also. I freely concede to my recent critic Münchmeyer that the miracle is not to be despised, and that there is a *relative* necessity for it in order to our faith, since the Lord

[1] The regulus of the Vulg. which does not presuppose, but has occasioned, the reading βασιλίσκος, appears to mean a royal prince. Why Nonnus has ἰθύνων στρατιήν in his paraphrase, does not appear.

[2] Pfenninger invents the circumstance of some sick having been healed at Sychar, but very unnecessarily, and in express contradiction to the enumeration in ver. 54.

acknowledged this by working the miracles. But I cannot admit, as he contends, that there is an *absolute* necessity; for, the Lord Himself speaks elsewhere (ch. x. 38, xiv. 11) of a higher order of faith which rests not upon the demonstration of miracles, and gave the preference to that. I do think, indeed, that the word to the woman which so marvellously unlocked the secrets of her heart, was also a miracle—but it was no τέρας. The conjunction of σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα, which in St John is only found here, and in St Matthew and St Mark only once (Matt. xxiv. 24; Mark xiii. 22; and in both cases very noteworthily of the deceivers!)[1] is in the same sense to be understood as we find from Deut. xiii. 1 downwards in many passages of the Old Testament אות and מופת combined yet significantly distinguished: it is *here* and not in profane writers that the usage is to be sought and explained. We must refer, as Gesenius properly says, מופת to the external side of the wonder—splendide, pulchre factum, portentum. The distinction which Klee cites from Origen very aptly hits the point: τέρας being the extraordinary manifestation in itself, but σημεῖον pointing to its internal significance; with which it well consists that things not in themselves miraculous may by the word of God become *signs*. We are astonished at τέρατα and marvel only, but when the wonder becomes a sign we *believe*. Yet this believing as the result of seeing is an impure and undesirable faith, instead of which the Lord everywhere desired the faith of the sinner as springing from heartfelt need, and resting on His word without the necessity of miracles. This is the profound truth which the saying now uttered discloses, a saying which of itself and alone indicates the true meaning and the right position of the miracle. That the man who receives this word is a Jew, follows necessarily from the *Ye* in which he is classed and included. Ye Jews generally, ye Galilæans in particular, thou and all thy fellows, and more than this as Rieger preaches—"Ye men of the world," or with Oetinger—"ye courtiers and politicians!" The Jews require a sign

[1] As Luthardt mentions against Schweizer's criticism of the "unjohannean" expression. We add, that τέρας or τέρατα alone, never occurs in the whole of the Gospels, and only in the New Testament at Acts ii. 19 as a quotation.

(1 Cor. i. 22), as we see that they did at Jerusalem (ch. ii. 18); and a condemnation of this *seeking after miracles* is evidently the general and primary starting-point of our Lord's word (in Nonnus *μῦθος νεμεσήμων*); nor can we succeed in evading this, though the more direct application to the case of this *βασιλικός* penetrates deeper. Ebrard says that "Jesus did *not* condemn his desiring a sign, but *only* that he did not believe on Himself before he came to the point of being constrained to ask it;" but we must be permitted to say instead of *not* and *only*—that Jesus *not merely* condemned the former, but also the latter *in addition.* For where else would be the included reference to the others; who must be the Galilæans as opposed to the Samaritans? And indeed the Lord does not at first concede to the slight and need-enforced faith with which the man sought the last Physician and demanded a sign, the character of faith at all; for He says—*οὐ μὴ πιστεύσητε.* There was something like this in the nobleman's meaning—"If thou restorest my son to health, *then* will I believe in Thee!" Thus without a sign he would not—And even when they saw signs and wonders, even then the Jews believed not! chap. xii. 37. Hence Schleiermacher keenly remarks that the Lord took care not positively to say, contrary to experience —"Signs and wonders will draw you to faith." We note the progress of the sense thus—"Unless ye have *signs*, and even *wonders*, and even these to be *seen* by yourselves." For there are other signs than wonders, and other wonders than visible. Thus this word in the beginning is similar to that final word to Thomas, chap. xx. 29.

It confuses these plain words, unnecessarily to understand the word as blaming this man's supposition of a necessity on the Lord's part to come down in person in order to the healing of his son.[1] Mary and Martha even thought that if the Lord had been there, He would have helped; and Jesus wondered at and celebrated the peculiar faith of the centurion, Matt. viii. 8. We cannot therefore suppose that He blamed what He afterwards yielded to; for He goes down as requested. A "rebuke of the

[1] Pfenninger—"Unless I stand before you, to perform signs and wonders before your very eyes!" So Luther in his sermon—"His faith does not reach so far as to believe that Jesus could give healing, not present."

unbelief which distrusted His healing at a distance,"[1] cannot be reconciled with the Lord's benignity, which never too soon required too much. It is quite another thing to interpret the thought, not actually expressed in the words but lying at their foundation,—And if *thou*, in particular, hadst not been driven by *need* to seek the last aid, which might possibly be granted, from Me, the worker of miracles, even thou wouldst hardly have asked it of Me! We may take it for granted that this man required this earnest saying; that with all his right feeling he took it ill, not that he found the Lord so disposed to look back upon the conduct of the Samaritans, but that knowing his heart so well, He should, notwithstanding, not suppress these words. Lange's view is altogether too harsh—"He certainly could not place Himself at the command of great rulers, who might suppose that *in their necessity they could employ Him as a wonderful Healer*, without declaring themselves in His favour and submitting to His influence." For such folly as this could hardly have entered the mind of any man; and if that had been the thought of this ruler, he would have been repelled with "Man, who made Me your wonder-working physician?" Whereas the Lord can presently kindle the spark of his faith into a clear flame for all his family. Lange's other remark is better, and has its value for many similar incidents in the evangelical record, that the Lord opposes to the precipitate excitement and haste of the man His own supreme self-possession and tranquillity. Compare, on this point, Matt. viii. 26, where He first replies to the cry for help by words of tranquil instruction.

Let the folly for ever cease—which even Sepp stigmatizes as "Protestant"—of attempting to make this history and that of Matt. viii. 5–13 only two several accounts of the same circumstance. If that centurion of Capernaum was strong in faith, this nobleman's is so weak that the Lord at first speaks of him as having none at all. But He does not forthwith extinguish the glimmering flax (see Luther's translation of Isa. xlii. 4); He rather unveils and condemns His unbelief in such a manner as to provoke him to a more energetic and striving faith. He has not denied absolutely the signs and wonders for its help; He

[1] Seiler, über die bewundernswürd. Thaten Jesu u. s. w. S. 42.

purposes only to tranquillize and humble the petitioner, to aid him to a proper consciousness of his position, and then to lead him, by the ample and astounding help of His power, to a higher and nobler faith. It might seem that at first His words did not find access to his heart; for the nobleman continues to urge his impatient petition, concealing this time unbelief and doubt; it must be as he thinks, Jesus must be a physician on the spot, *else his child dies.*[1] But the influence of His word had seized upon the centre of his soul; not only will it recur in due time, but it gives him at once an impression of the serene, heart-testing, essentially heart-seeking might and majesty of the great worker of miracles, very different from that scanty measure of hope and trust which he had brought with him. The Lord's second word would scarcely have been responded to by faith had it been the first, but now the way is prepared for its effect.

Ver. 50. We cannot concur with Schleiermacher, that the Lord would not go down with the nobleman according to his wish, simply because it was contrary to His present plan, and He would not be diverted from it by such a request. His plan was no other than to be always ready to succour and to save, wherever and withersoever he was desired; many a time did He give up His present purpose when a simple petition intervened. It is not in Himself but in the petitioner that we are to seek the reason of His thus and not otherwise responding to his prayer for healing. Lange assumes, contrary to the evident truth of the narrative and the analogy of all other such sayings of our Lord, a critical pause between the πορεύου and the ὁ υἱός σου ζῇ, so that the word falls into two words, the first of which plunges the man into the abyss of the reflection—He rejects me, He will not come down and help me! Oh no, the Lord has no other thought than to grant his desire. He does, indeed, make his word correspond with the twofold cry of the nobleman, but only that He may mightily stimulate and raise him to higher faith. *Go thy way*—I come not down, that is not needed! Thy son *liveth*—not *dies*, as thou in thine anxiety didst think! I know this better than thou! The Lord repeats the word of Elijah, 1 Kings xvii. 23, but without the *behold* of the then pre-

[1] But that is a good token that he does not take ill the severe answer, does not make a petulant reply.

sent and visible accomplishment. Not in the imperative, *Let him live!* for He meekly conceals His own might, as if it might be interpreted—Thou deceivest thyself, I know that he will recover. (Against which assumption, however, the Evangelist protests in the whole record down to ver. 54.) Nor in the future—*He will live*—for that might, on the one hand, have sounded too much like deferring the assurance of the boon, and on the other might have included too much in the promise for the future.

The result attests the wisdom, love, and power of the Lord. That the son at home is healed in the self-same hour in which the great word ζῇ is spoken at Cana is the lighter thing; the greater takes precedence, that the faith is secured before the miracle is wrought; the greatest of all, which crowns the whole, is the *faith*, in the last and fullest sense of the word, which only seldom is produced by any experience of miracles.[1] The man believed *the word*, it is said now as in ver. 41. The same words which the Lord had spoken meet him from the lips of his servants, assuring him of their accomplishment, and before the servants suspect the cause. The believing man asks another question, though he does not doubt, and only that he might enjoy all the more the assured reality—It was the self-same hour of yesterday.[2] A mere fulfilment of his request according to his own meaning and will would have scarcely made *this man* a disciple; but now and in the Lord's way he and all his family with him are healed of their sins.

[1] It is in order to pursue the process of unbelief overcome to its final point, that the Evangelist narrates all this so carefully; while Strauss only sees an anxiety to adjust the time "in order to establish the miracle."

[2] This *yesterday* is not an indication of the delay of a night in returning, but of the great speed of his going thither, since he had time enough left on the same day for part of the journey back. That χθές is said merely after sun-down (though Brückner admits it) we cannot possibly consent to.

THE THREE SAYINGS TO THE IMPOTENT MAN AT BETHESDA: AWAKENING, HELP, WARNING.

(Ch. v. 6, 8, 14.)

The nameless feast was that of Purim, as we have before asserted our conviction;[1] the visit to the Purim-festival on our Lord's part sprung from the same principle as the visit to the pool of Bethesda, that is, must be understood by reference to the same disposition of our Lord's mind. We are convinced that if Hengstenberg had gone as deeply into the entire problem of the evangelical harmony as he has into the seventy weeks, he would not have so stoutly opposed the general consent of critics in favour of this being the feast of Purim. Wieseler shows very convincingly how contradictory it is to the established usage of the Evangelist in indicating the festivals, to understand the *Passover* here;[2] we add, moreover, that we cannot see how the Evangelist, after naming this indefinite ἑορτή (for it remains at least uncertain whether the certainly spurious article before it may be found in the τῶν which follows), could immediately again in ch. vi. 4 mention the *following* passover. It was the enmity which was excited against Him in the days of the Purim that induced our Lord not to remain in Jerusalem until Passover. But this omission of even one Passover shows us already that we must not regard the Lord's attendance upon the feasts in the external and legal point of view, and as part of the "ful-

[1] The entire investigation is out of place here. Most of the ancients thought it the Pentecost—Cyrill., Chrys., Euthym., Theophyl. Then Erasm., Calv., Beza, Bengel, etc. Iren. assumed a second Passover, followed by Luther and many, especially Scaliger, with more recently Süskind, Paulus, Tholuck, Baumgarten-Crusius, Hengstenberg. Not to mention other suppositions, the Purim has been decided for by Keppler, Petavius, Lamy, Hug (more lately Lücke), Olshausen, Anger, Winer, Wieseler, Ebrard, Lange. It is out of the question, however, to leave the feast undecided.

[2] Though Neander defends this "most ancient view" on grounds that seem at first sight tenable, and the mystical and confused Sepp maintains it with great confidence.

filling of all righteousness." He felt Himself under the constraint of pure love at some time to participate in every feast and festival of the *Jewish people;* and it is more than probable that the Pentecost was not left altogether unregarded. Hence we can very well understand in general—however "strange" it may appear to Luthardt—that He should once (not by way of *preference!*) give His presence even to this feast, which Baumgarten-Crusius rather too unscrupulously stigmatizes as "crude in its *idea* and celebration." The position of the Book of Esther in the canon warrants us in recognising a fundamental element of good in its original foundation, notwithstanding all the coarseness which gradually crept into its subsequent celebration. In attending this feast our Lord did not manifest any peculiar "respect and recognition" of the revengeful and extravagant spirit which animated it, but merely a frank kindness for everything that concerned the Jewish people as such. Yea even the debauched manner in which these days of excess were spent,[1] contrary as it was to His affectionate feeling, would dispose Him once at least in His mercy, for compassionate intercession and blessing, to visit this melancholy caricature of a holy festivity.[2] Finally, it was nowhere to be altogether avoided, and in Jerusalem first might it be connected with its original and true foundation. It was regarded as a "festival of the poor;" hence it is quite in keeping that the Lord especially seeks out the place of the afflicted during the days of the feast; and we may safely say, in a typical reference, different from that according to which Hengstenberg (following Apollinarius of old) interprets the thirty and eight years of the impotent man like the five husbands of the Samaritan woman, that His visit to the Purim festival, and His visit to the pool of Bethesda, are strictly connected together. Comp. Esth. ix. 22.

We will not, moreover, as we are hastening to *the words* of

[1] We must not, however, attach too much weight, in that age, to the saying of the Talmud, that people were to drink till they could not distinguish any longer between the אָרוּר הָמָן and בָּרוּךְ מָרְדְּכַי (Buxt. Synag. cap. 29, p. 559).

[2] If not also the lofty opinion of the Jews concerning this feast, which was afterwards thus expressed—the Thorah and the Megilleh of Esther alone will not be abolished by the Messiah.

our Lord, permit ourselves to be led into any diffuse investigations as to the pool itself, and its attendant angel. The ἐστί (as Lücke has rightly acknowledged, comp. also Guericke's Introd.) gives no sure ground for supposing that this Gospel was written *before* the destruction of Jerusalem; although it stands strikingly enough between two preterites, contrasting with the κατέβαινεν, and yet seeming to say—The pool is still there, but the angel comes no more.[1] It does not affect the question, whether we supply after προβατικῇ (not reckoning the various readings), according to Nehemiah πύλῃ, or ἀγορᾷ, πλατείᾳ, χώρᾳ; the omission of πύλη, however, seems harsh, and we prefer to assume a market or open place, always connected with the sheep-gate. But the addition of the *angel* we cannot permit ourselves to give up, without far better proofs than any yet brought forward.[2] "This angel and his operation, which is altogether unscriptural, because not induced by any particular occasion, but fitful and capricious, we are happily rid of," says even Ebrard rejoicingly; but we are disposed rather to rejoice in a scriptural recognition of the profound doctrine of the influence and instrumentality of angels, fitful or not, in nature; a doctrine which Hofmann recently (Schriftbeweis i. 283 ff.) admits, with reference to this passage. We have only to refer, in order to vindicate the scripturalness of our text, to the word of Elihu in the ancient book of Job, ch. xxxvi. 32 (see v. Meyer's correction, and also his Bibeldeutungen S. 76, 77), as well as to the angel of the waters, Rev. xvi. 5.[3] A becoming reverence for Scripture will never admit that St. John wrote simply in

[1] The ἐστί scarcely indicates (as Lange thinks) a much later period, when Jerusalem was in part restored again.

[2] The Syriac, Latin, Æthiopic, and Arabic versions have it; similarly the Fathers, such as Tertullian, Ambrose, Chrysostom, Cyril, Augustin; and even Lachmann holds it firm. Not only does ver. 7 absolutely require the *whole* addition; but it alone makes the whole intelligible. De Wette's reasons for its genuineness against many otherwise respected opponents, Brückner confirms and strengthens; although, alas, he only makes the Evangelist defer to a popular opinion.

[3] Luthardt's protest (Ev. Joh. i. S. 13, 14) is nothing decisive; for he only contends, through misapprehension, against the opinion (not maintained by me) that all individual impulses and energies of nature are connected with angels.

conformity with the popular faith; this remarkable declaration seems rather to be an incidental disclosure of that great mystery, hidden from the people—the high power of the Son of God over the powers and energies of God's ministers in nature, themselves relatively miraculous (in Nonnus: ἀγγελικαὶ δυνάμεις). A right discernment would probably, in many cases, speak even now of a true genius of the healing waters, to which multitudes resort, which could be detected by no chemical analysis.[1] It is remarkable, too, that *this* water healed diseases of *every* kind, yet, again, only in the case of those who first stepped in at the crisis of its bubbling forth; similarly the κατὰ καιρόν by no means indicates anything periodical, and which might surely be anticipated,—else why the long lying and waiting of the sick? Thus there are strong and plain indications, in that part of the text which is uncontested, of something uncommon and profoundly mysterious.

The helping mercy of Christ, that working which like the Father's is incessant, is limited to no particular time. This Healer had visited the "house of mercy" in pure compassion; but no man appeals to Him for aid, the report of Him had not penetrated to this neglected place of mercy, or no one there yet knew His person. Yet the All-merciful cannot go away without leaving some *witness* of His power and of His love. Whom then does He choose out among so many? There are some who think that the mystery of election is here shadowed forth; we only see that the most miserable and helpless is the selected one. He was a *man* (this expression, since ch. ii. 25, we find specific in St John) who had passed thirty years in sickness; though he had not lain there so long. Jesus *knew* this as soon as he *saw* him lie. Though St John leaves the thirty and eight years (as St Luke, ch. xiii. 16, the eighteen) indefinite in the simple πολὺν ἤδη χρόνον, yet, on the other hand (as in ch. vi. 15), he also connects the indefinite γνούς so closely with the ἰδών as to leave no room for any information or detail of the period in the interval. It cannot be that He "came to know,"

[1] This is not, however, mere "personified energy of nature," as Martensen's Dogmatik has it; against whose doctrine of angels we must be more on our guard than his critic Schöberlein seems to be, who deals out his praise with only slight qualification.

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA.

even if we dispense with the additon αὐτός or ἐν ἑαυτῷ which Lücke thinks necessary. For there were none others present, at this feast-time, than those who cared for their sick,—the ὄχλος, ver. 13, had been called together by the rumour of the healing. Now, every sick man would have cried out for himself, or his friend for him; but this particular helpless one had to mourn that nobody cared for him. But he himself could not have yet told his own tale to Jesus; for St John gives us specifically the *beginning* of the conversation. The unprejudiced reader can find no place for information given to the Lord between these ἰδών, γνούς, λέγει all compacted together in one. The Evangelist further connects this γνούς so closely with the following λέγει, that we cannot but interpret it—Although he knew that, He put the strange question; for He knew something more which afterwards became manifest; He perceived in His spirit his whole history, and the secret disposition of the man's mind.

We have now three words addressed to him by the Lord—the preparatory word which arouses his soul, ver. 6; the word of His mighty power, ver. 8; the ensuing word of exhortation, ver. 14, in which the Lord at the same time revealed Himself as the worker of miracles on the Sabbath-day against whom the Jews had protested.

Ver. 6. All who are here are waiting intently and longingly for their healing! Yet the Lord addresses to the man a question such as never had been heard in this place before. It could not be spoken in mockery, and therefore must have been understood at first in its more obvious sense, afterwards disclosing its deeper meaning. We take the word according to the progressive stages of its meaning in His intention, just as we must ever do in such pregnant and condensed words of our Lord. First, in the ordinary sense of the appeal—Wouldst thou not be, art thou not here with an earnest desire to be, made whole, thou unhappy man? So far it is simply analogous with all those wondrous introductory words by which the Lord brings to consciousness the sense of need, and awakens faith by giving the presentiment of cure. But in connection with this, whatever the frivolity of folly may say against it, there is the aim to give beforehand all its importance to His help; for *Jesus*, in all healing whether of soul or body, must make *His own per-*

son prominent, for His own honour as well as for man's salvation. But here was a man, who in an especial manner needed to be aroused; and *in his case*, the three emphasized words which follow, profoundly studied, acquire a specific meaning. First—*Wilt* thou in very deed? For, although we may not agree with Lange, who characteristically says that "the man bore in his very *aspect* the stamp of a feeble will, of entire self-abandonment and prostration of mind," yet we must think that such was his character as penetrated by our Lord's glance. Hence Schleiermacher (Homilien über Joh. S. 323), sharply reproves him for having remained so long inert, instead of wholesomely using what little strength yet remained to him; which reminds us of the famous beggar of Woolston and Paulus, to whom the Lord in anger restored his legs. We do not think that it is intended to be intimated that our Lord rebuked his hopeless lying and waiting: yet he was a sluggish and dull-minded man (Richter—the opposite of that quick-witted one, ch. ix.), who, though he has in ver. 11 for once an appropriate word in his own defence, yet afterwards, ver. 15, deals in a manner half well-meaning, half thankless. Thus it is with emphasis—*Wilt* thou? And that *now?* Hast thou always willed it? *Thy will was* concerned in thy becoming thus, thou hast long atoned for that—hast thou now honestly done *all that thou couldst?* That might also mean—Hast thou sought help in penitent prayer to God, who giveth this water? The answer seems to apprehend it all in an external sense, but it shows that the sting of conviction has been planted.[1]—If we go further, and emphasize the second word—*whole*, then does it *awaken* in the man, even if understood of bodily healing, a deep sense of the full idea of what a restoration from so long-standing a calamity must be; and thus the point of the question would be (though his dull mind might not apprehend it)—Hast thou courage, confidence, and hope enough to admit that thou mayest be actually once more a sound man? And strong faith in order to that help which is now not far from thee? Finally, we may be sure that *the Lord Himself* would also silently think of that spiritual soundness which was alone worthy of the name; and might well therefore be supposed to

[1] We are quite at one with Steinmeyer's excellent sermon on "*Wilt* thou be made whole?" at least in its substance.

emphasize also the last word γενέσθαι (not ἰᾶσθαι), just as His final word closes the whole, ver. 14, pointedly referring *to this.*

The man, sunk into abject, despondent resignation to his fate, is somewhat stimulated by the question; but "his answer does not amount to a categorical desire to be cured" (Lange). Yea, not even to an *expression* of his presentiment—Wilt thou then help me, by waiting here, and bearing me in, or in what other way? But he merely *excuses himself*, and that with complaints against his neighbours, which though apparently not wanting in right, are passed over by the Lord without any confirmation. (Steinmeyer.) With depressed resignation he seems to say—Alas, with me it is all one, I *can* not be made whole. Every one here thinks only of himself or of his sick charge, but, wretch that I am, I *have no man*, who will without special friendship, and for nought but love and charity, take pity upon me![1]

Ver. 8. It is upon this utter helplessness of prostration, in the faint expression of which we can assume no more than a minimum of responding faith, that the thunder-cry of Divine power suddenly bursts in from the mouth of Jesus! A glorious type and prelude of that great saying, afterwards uttered—The dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God and live! As in Matt. ix. 6, the arising and taking up of the bed is commanded—as an evidence to himself and to others of perfect cure, as a symbolical expression of victory over sickness (which is thus made a show of, as Ps. xli. 4, כָּל־מִשְׁכָּבוֹ הָפַכְתָּ), and, at the same time, in this case as well as in that other, to intimate the propriety of not all at once forgetting, in the midst of the highest joy, the bed upon which he had so long lain, and on which he had endured so much sorrow. Thus the Lord in this case suppresses the *leaping* which, inappropriate here, was quite in place at Acts iii. 8. Then, and only thus, is he to *walk;* ever mindful of his bed, that he be no more cast down upon it. We feel that in each of these three words there is a new element of secret exhortation; indeed without forcing the sense we may see the three words, addressed to him at the first, reflected in these now

[1] Teschendorff very inappropriately imagines that he was loathed and avoided by all on account of the notorious punishment of his sin! And with still less probability he puts into his mouth the sobbing outcry—"Alas, I justly suffer?"

spoken. *Rise*—corresponds with the first arousing of his will, ver. 6. *Take up thy bed*—is the index and expression of the present healing; and *walk* already points forward to that exhortation, for the time to come, which we find in ver. 14.

The Lord commandeth and it is done. But another consequence of the miracle appears among the ill-disposed Jews who, though they see the sign, yet will not believe. The Ἰουδαῖοι (in St John, as is well known, either οἱ ἄρχοντες simply, or something similar), reflect upon the man that was healed the violation of the Sabbath! Upon the man, however, who had been most *wonderfully* enabled to rise up from a bed of long sickness, as he himself and all the people attest,—else would they have more sharply rebuked him than by the simple οὐκ ἔξεστί σοι. Upon the man who had been healed *by Jesus*, as these reprovers would easily suppose,—else would they very probably not have reproved him at all. For prophets and workers of miracles had from the beginning possessed a recognised command over the Sabbath. Now although the healed man might not know the precise ordinances which prescribed their immunity, he replies to the unexpected objection and counter-command as if in the high impulse given to his whole being his understanding had seized it, and refers to a prophet's authority as a matter of course. "He that *made me whole* (not who healed me—but who as the further result of His mighty word made me a sound man again) the same said unto me, and with the same command—Take up thy bed and walk! *This* was the mighty word which made me whole; thus he commanded me to *rise up;* and should I continue to lie there? Should I not hearken to such a worker of wonders and witness to his work? Is not that without further ado account enough of it?" The Jews feel how incontrovertible the plain answer is, they desist from any further reflection upon the healed man, and proceed to turn their attack upon the original cause of this wrong. They assume to be quite unfamiliar with His person, speaking of Him as ὁ ἄνθρωπος, whereas it was perfectly well known to every one that no man but Jesus of Nazareth performed such wonderful works. They malignantly leave out the main point when they *omit* to say—What man is that which *made thee whole? They* knew very well who it was, but the healed man knew not; for as the ὄχλος accumulated

on occasion of the cure the Lord withdrew Himself; the man was at the first moment busy about himself and his bed, so that his helper did not meet his eye. None of those who stood around would say—it was Jesus, as Teschendorff this time well observes.

Ver. 14. The Lord understands all this, and will not now withdraw from the accusation; it was for the sake of this public acknowledgment of His ἐργάζεσθαι, as well as for a retrospective exhortation to the man himself, that He uttered His third word. He findeth him in the temple, a circumstance which might indicate that the man's mind was turned to God in gratitude; yet was this feeling not firmly rooted enough, it needed to be encouraged. Roos remarks very pertinently that Jesus could not further reveal Himself to the healed man, inasmuch as He perceived in him none of that capacity and fitness for it which He discerned in the blind man; He therefore only gave him "the general exhortation" which we read. We may observe, however, that this exhortation, when deeply studied, has nothing "general" in it. The first word of it does not simply run as in the German, siehe zu! look to it! so that a warning would be sounded in the midst of his new happiness,—in that sense we find ὅρα, ὁρᾶτε, βλέπετε. But the ἴδε points first, in the sense of a graciously confirming הִנֵּה, to the healing which he had experienced; but then passes over presently into a warning, which is spoken with a three-fold progression of profound, symbolical, and far-reaching meaning. Thou art physically "made whole" through great mercy, even as through earlier *sinning* it was thy will to be sick; sin no more, lest, in relapsing into bodily infirmity, a *worse thing* come unto thee, that is, first of all, the sharper, bitterer experience which a severer punishment of heavier guilt would entail upon thee, after having tasted the blessedness of health. The second punishment might be harder than even the first to bear! This is the first meaning, to which, however, we cannot be content to restrict it, any more than the man who heard the words afterwards did. "See, this is soundness of body which thou now dost so joyfully experience; thy sickness came from thy *sinning*, it is sin that makes sick, it is itself the *worse sickness of the soul.* Guard then against that; that would be a much worse thing, even if thy body remained

sound, especially the relapse into sin after so much discipline and grace! That would be much worse than thirty and eight years' bodily suffering, which, indeed, thou canst not again undergo!" And thus we arrive at the last meaning, which makes the whole say, with its commencement included, a symbolical word for every saved and converted sinner—like that to the adulteress, ch. viii. 11. It graciously recognises the man's thankfulness towards God, which prompted him to go to the temple, as a spiritual cure, and confirms him in it; but by that critical χεῖρόν τι (comp. Matt. xii. 45) it points to the frightful relapse which must here be cautiously guarded against. Further, observe these two things—That the Lord knows the man's life of sin before the sad thirty and eight years began; and also the gentle lamentation in the μηκέτι (not μὴ πάλιν, δεύτερον) over his continuance in "sin" throughout his long sickness;[1] thus showing that *now first*, in his unmerited physical cure, is his *soul made whole*. (Then might it have been more appropriately said to this sick man—See, in and by this sickness thou hast been made whole!)

TESTIMONY TO THE JEWS: CONCERNING THE OPERATION OF THE SON, IN THE UNITY OF THE FATHER, IN QUICKENING AND IN JUDGMENT; THE PUNISHMENT OF UNBELIEF IN THE FATHER'S TESTIMONY; APPEAL TO THE SCRIPTURES AND MOSES.

(Ch. v. 17, 19–47.)

In vers. 15, 16 we see the harmlessness of a weak mind, and the malice of self-willed wickedness, set one against the other. For it is a marvel to us how Schleiermacher can make his pointing out Jesus to the Jews an evidence of the man's "hardness of heart and utter reprobation of mind." We cannot even agree with the Berlenb. Bibel in thinking it a very "suspicious circumstance" that the man, instead of cleaving to his benefac-

[1] Not, as Teschendorff prematurely interprets the Lord's meaning,—What fruit these thirty-eight years might have borne!

tor, goes straightway to the Jews to curry favour with them. We rather think it quite in harmony with his character, as exhibited in the whole narrative, that he thus exhibits a combination of good intention and weakness of mind. The ἀπῆλθεν intimates some slight disapprobation of the inappropriateness and inconsiderateness of the act, but nothing more. It is evident from his indirect saying, that his intention was not to denounce Jesus: it is not,—He that commanded me to take up my bed is Jesus; but—He that *made me whole.* He thus holds fast to his first justification, ver. 11, but does not observe, in his short-sightedness, the symptoms of lurking enmity which threatened his benefactor: he now, as in his first answer to Jesus, has only himself and his own justification in view—Now they must settle it with this Jesus! And as soon as he openly declares what the questioners knew very well already, the enmity already existing in their hearts bursts out in an actual διώκειν. It comes in, as the issue and aim of the whole introductory historical narration, and as the preface to the subsequent great testimony of Jesus,—Therefore did the Jews persecute Jesus, and sought to slay him, because he had done *these things* on the Sabbath day.[1] The ταῦτα with the διὰ τοῦτο are set down by the Evangelist not without ironical allusion to the folly and audacity of the Jews in merging this most eminent and notorious miracle into a mere ποιεῖν ἐν σαββάτῳ: compare the τοῦτο in Acts iv. 7. But this only brings into more glorious relief the sublime wisdom and long-suffering love of our Lord, which does not instantly chastise their perverseness, but entering into their objection repays their malignity with words of superabounding grace, unfolding to them all that they needed to know in order to their salvation (ver. 34), though He full well knows that they will not yield to Him, and that they will not believe. May we assume here any previous questioning of Jesus, or anything like a judicial inquiry? Lange supposes some official forms, with a probable summons before the lesser Sanhedrim; and appeals to the ὑμεῖς ἀπεστάλκατε, ver. 33, which however is not decisive, for it might be said of the members of the Sanhedrim in their

[1] Roos thinks that they were disposed to deal gently with the healed man, because of his imbecility of spirit;—but that is too strongly expressed, for he had justified himself in his way with much intelligence.

private capacity. We agree with Lücke that what follows does not by any means favour the supposition that Jesus was standing before a tribunal. And the διώκειν, even if in the Greek it occurs *sensu forensi*, would be here when connected with the μᾶλλον ζητεῖν ἀποκτεῖναι but a strange expression to designate a judicial procedure; and, moreover, the Lord would scarcely, in the presence of the official Rulers, have spoken in a style which omitted all recognition of their office, with so much direct attack upon their consciences and rebuke to their hearts as individuals simply. Assuredly He stood and spoke here *in statu confessionis* before the constituted authorities and representatives of the Jews, but nothing more. Finally, we do not even think it necessary to assume that these Ἰουδαῖοι opened the conversation by any direct challenge; that they urged their questions and complaints by referring to the rest of the Father Himself on the Sabbath. If anything of this kind had preceded, which would explain the first clause of ver. 17, St John would not have omitted to mention it; according to our conviction the ἀπεκρίνατο only records an *anticipatory* commencement of the attack on the part of Jesus.[1]

Ver. 17. This word at one stroke lays bare the inmost heart of the question at issue, or to speak with Neander, "grasps the very roots of the error." Very far now, as ever, from opposing the Sabbath as an institution, or giving the slightest hint of an approaching abrogation of it, the Lord rather penetrates and clearly exhibits the true, scriptural idea of the Sabbath, in opposition to the blind externality of the Jewish interpretation; that, namely, which could give rise to the contention between the schools of Hillel and Schammai—as to whether the sick might be comforted on the Sabbath! He goes up at once to the foundation of the Sabbath, and the principle of it in God's rest after creation, as given by Moses in the beginning of the Scripture; but He is very far from correcting, much more from contradicting, this Mosaic word—as some shortsighted expositors have thought. We know with what respect He ever quoted and expounded the holy words given at the beginning of things

[1] See the second volume on Matt. xii. Whether this allegation of Sabbath-breaking was the *first* which had occurred, cannot be absolutely settled, but it is scarcely probable.

—see for example Matt. xix. 4. But he corrects that childish misapprehension which could imagine inactivity in God, and thence adhere so rigidly and stiffly to entire inactivity in the Sabbath of man, of which God's Sabbath was the exemplar. The designedly chosen expression ἐργάζεσθαι, undoubtedly, first of all indicates "id quod sabbato vetitum;" but only, that is, what the Jews had falsely forbidden, and therefore charged against Jesus, by no means what God had expressly forbidden to Israel. The first fundamental thought is rather a protest against the folly which would absolutely exclude all ἐργάζεσθαι, all *activity* or energy from the Sabbath. We must at the outset make a threefold distinction, if we would penetrate the Lord's word thoroughly:—first is the *Jewish* Sabbath proper, which as a portion of the types and shadows of the intermediate ritual law, must cease; the Sabbath of *the decalogue*, which with the decalogue itself retains all its inviolability for all mankind, and only in Christianity can find its full perfection as an external ordinance working from within outwardly; finally, the *paradisaical* Sabbath of man before the Fall, which was most directly related to the archetypal rest of God, although appointed by the Creator in conformity with man's nature even there, as a needful alternation of the inward with the outward, and of rest with labour. The first and second the Lord leaves untouched, for their own domain and time: He only slightly connects His words even with the third, in order to rise immediately to that *Sabbath of God* which began with the end of creation, and from then ἕως ἄρτι has continued, in order to vindicate for *it* and with *the Son's right* for Himself, an unbroken ἐργάζεσθαι. For *here* utterly disappears all antithesis of work and festival which held good in creaturely life, whether under the labour-curse of sin or in the time of grace; here the Father keepeth His Sabbath by His very energy in all His works—generally in conservation, and after the Fall in saving and restoring. The rest of God is no mere inactivity; but, to speak in the fashion of the Jews (and thus to demonstrate their error by their own words), He himself *breaks* continually His great Sabbath. Bengel: si non operatur, ubi esset ipsum sabbatum? Braune: If God had rested as the Jews rested on the Sabbath—no sun would have shone, no flowers would have bloomed, all creation would have

languished, and the universe been dissolved. He "imparts to nature her invigorating forces," as Herder expresses it, causes the rain to fall and fruits to grow, yea even the waters of Bethesda to bubble forth on the Sabbath, so that no Jew might have been held unrighteous in descending for cure, yea, even would have waited for it, on the Sabbath-day. And with more immediate reference to the present case:—He doeth good and maketh sound, else must the sick man whom God's help, sought or experienced on the Sabbath, has healed, tarry upon his sick couch still. And, in addition to all that we have already embraced, there arises the great thought which, though not expressed and only *indicated*, brings out the profoundest contrast with the Jewish misconception, that this working *of God* does not by any means break or disturb the Divine rest.[1] The incontrovertible principle is thus established for *our* Sabbath, for the Jewish in some sense, but much more for the Christian, that a mere οὐκ ἐργάζεσθαι can never be the meaning and design of the institution; but—as every copy must harmonize with its exemplar—that the Sabbath is ordained for all kind of work that man can do in imitation of God. For this is the goal to which the saints must aspire, to enjoy in God the ceaseless rest of worshipping festivity, and to do in God the unresting work of goodness—like the four living creatures around the throne, in Rev. iv. 8. The *main point*, however, to which the Lord's words hasten, through all these meanings, in the first clause, is this alone:—that He marks *Himself* out as the *Son* from the rest of mankind, who, relatively speaking, must yet rest; and with a transcendent and unshared right arrogates to *Himself alone* for the present the deep, full truth of the Sabbath rest, that sublime unity of a festal labour in God, which, while it transfigures and glorifies, abolishes the Sabbath. This is the σκάνδαλον of His words, too high for their Jewish mind, but which they must hear—My Father, *and I also!* With equal

[1] Thus much is true. But the favourite formula of *philosophy*, that "creation and preservation cannot be separated in God," following which Bruch, for example (Stud. u. Krit. 1848. 3. S. 566), interprets the Lord's words to mean that God's creation is an eternal work, is *false*, for in that case the rest of God from and in His works, of which Heb. iv. 10 so profoundly speaks, would have no reality. It is not a mere anthropomorphism, but our great σαββατισμός is a copy of the Divine.

right, in the same manner, unrestingly doing the works of God in the world. (Chap. ix. 3, 4.) Teschendorff well says: "Can the Sabbath be better sanctified than in doing the works of God? and was it not proof of its being a work of God, that the healed man took up his bed and walked?" And because this work already gave its testimony, sign, and proof, the Lord could, though in the mildest form, administer reproof to his opponents; and then preserving silence concerning it, pass on to simple *assertion* and maintenance of the truth. "Do ye not see that I work even as the Father, that the Father in Me hath wrought this work, and therefore that I am *the Son?*" Thus does He perseveringly connect His own great testimony with the conviction which was already wrought, and only opposed through unbelief:—this man Jesus calleth God His Father, He is the expected Messiah, the Son of God come among men! By this He once more lays down the *thema* of the discourse which He now enters upon, as of all His testimonies concerning His own person; if they yielded to this κἀγώ as flowing from the πατήρ μου, there would be no more contention about breaking the Sabbath, but the question would be their own salvation, and all would be won. *The Father* and *the Son* in personal distinction, but in indivisible unity of nature—is the theme that runs through the whole of the discourse thus occasioned by their enmity, and the whole is but the continuation and expansion of the first sentence. "The Father remaineth Father, and the Son His Son; each maintains His dignity," but at the same time—The working and the honour of the Father and of the Son *are but one*, even as the Father and the Son are one.

The Jews—darkened as were their minds—understood this luminous word full well; infinitely better, indeed, than a certain philosophy of our own day which is for ever in vain spelling out the mystery, or rather throwing disguises over it, and has never yet discovered *who Jesus was.*[1] They take their πατέρα ἴδιον (in the personal, incommunicable and unshared sense, as in Rom. viii. 32) from His πατήρ μου, their ἴσον τῷ θεῷ rightly enough

[1] In which theology we do not class the orthodox Scripture-interpretation of Hofmann, although in "Son of God," and ἴσον τῷ θεῷ in this place, we would fain find very much more than he admits (Schriftbeweis i. 116).

from His κἀγώ.[1] But now comes in their *self-willed* and perverse *misunderstanding;* for they begin with ἔλεγε, but instead of continuing with λέγων they go on to say ποιῶν—and it is in this word that the pith of their contradiction is to be sought. For, as the Lord sets out from the assumed testimony to the truth of His λέγειν, so they set out from that axiom which their unbelief is bent upon holding fast—*that He was only man.* (Chap. x. 33.) And under this determined prejudice everything that He says rises or is perverted into a presumptive blasphemy, of which stoning was the due penalty. The vindication of Himself was to them incomparably worse than the original offence, the λύειν τὸ σάββατον.[2] They place in the ἑαυτόν a created man in full antithesis with God; they pass over altogether the υἱός which sprung out of the πατήρ; they regard the ἴσον τῷ θεῷ, if I may so speak, in a Swedenborgian sense, as it were a Deus-homo; and elevate the plain λέγειν into a horrible and blasphemous ποιεῖν ἑαυτόν. We must leave it undecided whether the ἐζήτουν ἀποκτεῖναι only indicates the rising of their murderous desires, or whether with Teschendorff we should supply some outcry—"Stone Him! stone Him!" We prefer the former supposition; since in the latter case the Evangelist would not have omitted to mention it, as the taking up of stones in chs. viii. 59 and x. 31. Amid such opposition and misunderstanding the Lord proceeds to make His first word the text of a continuous discourse, which, if not immediately depending upon it, yet certainly followed immediately upon it as its development; and it is a marvellous circumstance "that the Lord could go through so long a discourse, which would hardly be tolerated in the consistorial courts of our day."[3] Pfenninger makes his Nathanael relate that "all, evil and good, were constrained to listen to Him, and let Him go on uninterrupted. And yet they were so filled with malice as to make us fear that they would not suffer Him to say a word!" That most venerable father in Christ, Inspector

[1] In which the Lord did by no means *merely* "claim for Himself an equal right over the Sabbath!"

[2] But we must not say that then "they let go the first charge quickly enough"—for that would imply their acknowledgment of the justification given.

[3] As the Berlenb. Bibel remarks.

Zeller,[1] calls this discourse "a testimony of Jesus to Himself which is without parallel in the evangelical history," and then goes on to bear his own testimony thus:—"That which Jesus knew in His most internal Divine self-consciousness, and uttered thus out of His perfect knowledge, we must receive in our hearts and let *ripen there* into the ever-increasing light and power of a living apprehension; not by any developments of the ideas which our own understandings may elaborate, but by receiving the living impressions of His single works and of His entire working, the living impressions produced by a believing perception of the full harmony between the testimony of God in Scripture and the whole personality of Jesus; thus arriving at the great mystery of blessedness—God manifest in the flesh." We take these noble words of a theologian, who, though belonging to no academical order, is yet taught of God, as the norm and *limit* of our humble exposition. We rejoice that at least in a certain degree the time is come for unbiassed hearing and reading the sayings of our Lord, even in scientific theology, and that we are free in some degree from rationalist and dogmatic tormenting of words alone. Yet there is misunderstanding enough left; and it is our endeavour to remove this, and to lead *hearts* and *consciences* to experience, through right understanding, the living ἐξουσία of the testimony which lies before us. We seek nothing more; for, who could think of exhausting a chapter like this, which gives us the whole true dogmatic concerning the person of Christ, the full plan of salvation for every individual soul, as well as the entire history of the world and the church down to the last day, the confirming aggregate of all the testimonies of the Father to the Son in work, and word, and Scripture, the fundamental and radical exposure and conviction of all unbelief?

Ver. 19. The *Son* who worketh in the unity of the Father, this *Son of man* who before our eyes testifies of Himself as the *Son of God*, doeth generally (in a continual Sabbath) *no other than the works of God.* Many signs like this last had He exhibited to them, as and because the *Father* had shown and given

[1] Monatsblatt von Beuggen, 1844, in which Numbers 11 and 12 expound the whole discourse. Would that our theologians gave more heed to the expositions of this Monatsblatt.

them to *Him*. "But these preliminary signs are slight in comparison of those *greater* works, which should and will indeed excite your wonder." This is the commencement of His words, provoking them to a wholesome marvelling and belief, arousing their hearts and understandings by a most exciting, yet clear and serene, declaration. But He allows no time for questioning; His answer prevents their thoughts, and overwhelms all comparatives in one great superlative. "Do ye ask what are the greater works? They are those two *greatest* works of God, strictly connected together for mankind, and which you look for in the Messiah,—*Resurrection* and *Judgment!* Otherwise, indeed, than your expectation thinks, each of them heralding itself beforehand in bodily resurrection, but essentially and preeminently preparing its way in spiritual quickenings—for the raising of the dead even now goes on, and with it the judgment. Finally, at the end of the days, the resurrection and the judgment of the human race by *My* voice, that voice which ye should now listen to in faith, in order now to receive *life* according to *My* sayings which even now in mercy judge your *unbelief* in Me." This is the general outline of the former part of the discourse, which is defensive in its immediate, and most mighty maintenance and assertion; until in ver. 32, taking a new commencement, it expressly *appeals* to the *testimonies* which His words had received and should receive.

With all His loftiness of assertion,—which, designed to excite their astonishment, alas, would only be an additional *offence* to the unbelievers,—the humble Son of man softens the indispensable testimony as much as it was possible and right to do. He does not set out by laying down, undisguisedly, and at the outset, that most decisive ἕν ἐσμεν with which He is constrained to close His words in ch. x.; but He gives such a turn to this introductory testimony to His own unity and equality with the Father, as to make prominent first the most easily intelligible side of the relation, that which was strictly analogous with mere human doing of the works of God—the perfect *subordination* of the Son, who carries on and continues that which was given, or shown to Him, of the Father. The contradiction of these sinners—which He must contradict—had represented the essential nature and the highest climax of presumptuous sin to be

—the desire to make itself equal with God; and He now in strict opposition to that Himself exhibits complete *obedience*. He thus distinctly connects His words with all that was correct in the Jewish teaching—"that the Messiah would do nothing of His own will, but everything simply according to the will of God."[1] But that it is only as the Son that He can do this, was concealed from their darkened understanding, or perverted by it; therefore He must explicitly add this declaration; thus He adheres with His Ἀμὴν Ἀμήν to the great word—*The Son!* He never retracts that; but as far as they have been able to understand it, He makes it a foundation; from it He deduces all that He has further to say. To do anything *of Himself*, in the sense in which the Jews meant it, who even charged Him with ποιεῖν ἑαυτὸν ἴσον τῷ θεῷ, would indeed have been sin and blasphemy. "In this *self* lies the sting and venom (of their allegation); and it is this which He gathers out and rejects"—as the Berlenb. Bib. says. For He comes not to them in His own name, but the Father's (ver. 43). He speaketh not a lie, of *his own* (ch. viii. 44), but the truth of God—otherwise He *can* not speak or act.

This is a most mighty οὐ δύναται (to which afterwards, ver. 44, the πῶς δύνασθε ὑμεῖς corresponds), as it here stands at the head before ὁ υἱός. Expositors vainly and needlessly perplex themselves—whether orthodox or heterodox—with trifling discussions upon the plain truth of this expression. Assuredly their meaning is *first*,—The Son can do nothing independently, presumptuously, sinfully, in the manner of sinful men who have fallen from God, because and in that *He will not*, because His will as that of a personal man is entirely subject to the will of the Father who sent Him, as we find in ver. 30. But the words instantly demand another application; and, sinking deeper, we are constrained to admit that this moral impossibility, so to speak, has its root only in a natural, essential impossibility; and the expression is so far the true interpretation of that name of the Messiah which the Jewish doctrine did not thus discern—*the Son*. For every creature can as creature pervert its freedom into independence against God; even in the case of the angels who abode faithful, and whose fidelity is confirmed, apostasy is possible and

[1] Majus, theol. jud. p. 130.

imaginable under one aspect; but the Eternal Son standing in unity of being with the Father, even now that He is become man, can not *as the Son* sin, break the Sabbath, arrogate to Himself anything unrighteously; He can only do such works of power and love, as shall constrain every one to confess—He could not do these things if God were not in Him![1] What He doeth, that He seeth the Father do, by His perfect, most inwardly-contemplative knowledge of Him and of His Divine action; just as in some sense analogously sinful man may in some slight sense see what the Father doeth in the world, in nature, and in history; may behold the incessant works of God in quickening, healing, helping, blessing, as also in judging and casting away. The concluding clause of the verse declares the same thing positively which had been declared negatively; it is not, however, on that account tautological, but the γάρ indicates it as the *ground* of His reply to their contradiction, referring to the Sabbath-work which they had just seen—"Is it not so, have I then done anything different from what the Father doeth? An ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ in your sense is impossible to Me; My humanity, in which I place myself—κἀγώ—on an equality with the Father (yet only as *Son*, the express image of the archetypal Father) is not an individualised humanity, having in it an independent self" —therefore He adheres to the ὁμοίως ποιεῖ." That was My meaning in My former words—ver. 17—and that is the truth!" Their opposition had seized and exhibited the head of the offence in the πατέρα ἴδιον, and the Lord in His considerate condescension omits this one expression now at the first, instead of pressing it

[1] The other side of the question, that the *Son of man* as such *could* in the nature of things sin (see my Hebräerbrief i. S. 51), may have its own vindication; but as that is not the point *here* we need not enter into the discussion of it. The analogous relation in the regenerate (1 John iii. 9), is a problem which baffles our full comprehension; it is a mystery that, on the one hand, while we daily sin, the impossibility of sin in the child of God is asserted, and yet that the possibility of sin in the Son of Man should be maintained. At a critical moment like this in John v. the Lord speaks, with perfect correctness, of an imaginable ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ which is at the same time declared impossible; not however speaking with an "indistinct and one-sided reference to the human," but with perfect precision (See de Wette 4 Aufl.). In Gethsemane, again, there rise out of His obscuration the rejected and resisted ὡς ἐγὼ θέλω, τί ἐγὼ θέλω, τὸ θέλημά μου with a marvellous positive-negative reality.

further, as He might have done and afterwards did, even to the full ἕν ἐσμεν; He accommodates Himself to their point of understanding, without surrendering the full truth, in the softened ὁμοίως, "which might be perverted, as the Arians have perverted it, taking it merely for *resemblance*, in their down-hill course" (Berlenb. Bib.). But the whole of the subsequent discourse takes care of the truth, and shows us most plainly that full unity and equality of nature must be understood as underlying this expression. And so it is also a retrograde and false restriction to understand here the οὐδὲν, ἐὰν μὴ τι,—ἃ γὰρ ἂν, ταῦτα as merely meaning—*Only* that which the Father doeth, not *all* that the Father doeth. For if the former only is expressed by his condescending design, yet, in the unity of this testimony with all the rest, the latter must also be included. Listen to the next words, and in ver. 20 this rejected πάντα is plainly heard, just in the spirit of the Prologue:—πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο, καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ οὐδὲ ἕν.

Ver. 20. Stroke follows stroke, so that no Arian, whose ears are disposed to hear, can deny the Athanasian confession of our Lord. The *present* ποιεῖ, which in the previous verse connected itself with the individual works, such as that which had then taken place, now becomes the Present of the Divine eternity, in which *all*, *all* the works of God from the Creation to the Judgment are exhibited at once. In this lies a grand transition to absolute universality, from which then naturally follow the promised μείζονα τούτων. That the eternal Father hath an eternal Son, to whom He showeth all His works, gives Him to do them, and through whom He doeth them, has its foundation in *love*, for love is the essence of God. The common exposition only passes rapidly over the middle term, with Bengel's qui amat, nil celat; but to us it seems more proper to pause upon this equally simple and inexhaustible "ὁ πατὴρ φιλεῖ[1] τὸν υἱὸν," which is once more announced with γάρ; and to dwell on it profoundly, until we

[1] On the other hand, ἀγαπᾷ in ch. iii. 35, which hence is also a various reading here. It is hard to say whether the two expressions in St John are to be distinguished. The Greeks indeed distinguished them, similarly as *amare* and *diligere* in the Latin; but the Hellenists do not appear to have preserved the distinction. Yet the Syriac has here the more inward רחם.

have discerned in it the most essential *mysterium trinitatis.* The Berlenb. Bibel here once more puts to shame our modern most learned commentaries, for it does not pass by this depth of meaning, "God cannot possibly be an unfruitful and solitary unity, because God is love. Even if we had not been created by God, God would still be a *Father;* this name depends not upon the creature, but flows out of the eternal love of God. In the Divine essence there is a Father; so there must be a Son; so must there also be *love,*[1] and a fellowship. The Father hath *nothing* alone and for Himself but that He is Father; but He could not be that, were there not a Son. *As the Son doeth nothing without the Father, no more is the Father secret to the Son,* or keepeth back ought from Him, but He showeth Him *all things* that Himself doeth."[2] Yes, this is here the inmost kernel of the word: passing far beyond the possible comprehension of its first hearers, and giving a testimony to the church of all futurity—an essentially supplementing correlative to that first word concerning the love of God to the world, ch. iii. 16. Whom did the Father love before, and independently of, the world? Himself in the Son, through whom and in whom alone His entire φιλεῖν as all His ποιεῖν flows forth. This helps us to the profound meaning of the humanly-spoken δεικνύειν; which we must not understand as if the Father had ever previously performed a work of Himself alone, which he then set before the Son, completely done, for imitation. Such a view draws the expression downwards; instead of going up with it, as its condescension to our need designed, to the heights of its meaning. The *showing* of what He doeth is manifestly the *giving over* to Him to do; an essential participation, by which the Father doeth nothing alone, but all things by the Son; a revealing in the act. Assuredly, according to human ideas δεικνύειν may be equivalent to διδάσκειν (as the Lord Himself, in chap. viii. 28, speaks in a yet more accommodated sense, with regard to His

[1] Fr. v. Baader says:—"The idea of *love* is that of the trias, that of uniting distinction and distinguishing unity."

[2] We pressingly recommend the exposition of the speculative portion of St John's Gospel by a German mystical theologian of the fourteenth century, edited by Engelhardt. Neustadt, 1839. See, for example, in pages 19 and 20, just what is said above.

λαλεῖν)—hence it corresponds in 1 Sam. xii. 23, LXX., to the Hebrew הוֹרָה; and the teaching of antiquity, wiser and profounder than our modern, may have introduced the learner to the mysteries by symbols, and the gradual unveiling of hidden things;[1] but all this affords but a weak analogy with the mutually corresponding *seeing* of the Son and *showing* of the Father, that uninterrupted fellowship of reciprocal contemplation which the incarnated Son coming from the eternal bosom of the Father hath brought with Him, and of which He now speaks. All the works of God were, before their coming into act in time, existing as eternal ideas; but as they took place in time, the *Son of man truly seeth* them successively, as they are progressively *shown* to Him in, and in order to, their being done; yet always by that same contemplation as the eternal Son, and as the Son of man which is in heaven. Philo platonizes, upon the unpenetrated ground of the Cabala, concerning the Logos:—*μιμούμενος τὰ τοῦ πατρὸς, ὅσους πρὸς παραδείγματα ἀρχέτυπα τὰ ἐκείνου βλέπει*, but this is far from reaching to the sublime depth of that simple *φιλεῖν καὶ δεικνύειν*, of which the Logos incarnate Himself speaks. Here there is less room for speculative interpretation than for penetrating contemplation:—if we thus reverently contemplate this truth it may be *shown* to us also. "Ye shall see *greater things* than those which I have already done"—thus does the Lord speak to the Jews, as to the first disciples, chap. i. 50. For the Father gives and shows to His Son ever greater and greater things, even to the full consummation of those two *greatest* works of God—the final Quickening and the Judgment, which all must most assuredly see at the last. We are free to admit some truth in the view which Schleiermacher does not omit to bring prominently forward, that there may be reference in these words, first of all, to the ever-increasing insight of the Son of man into the future development of His work, or rather the future unfolding and manifestation of His own Person;[2] but

[1] As Schwarz, in his Jahrbuch (1825 Juli), remarked on Lücke's commentary, at this passage.

[2] For "the Work of Jesus is the unfolding of His Person." We cannot be too earnest in carrying along with this fundamental axiom of Christology (by Ebrard v. Abendm. i. 203 so strongly maintained), the fact that the inexhaustible consequences systematically unfold themselves.

we shall feel it necessary to modify this, if we remember that foresight of the future greater things, that prospective view of His whole work which Jesus had from the beginning, and which is testified in this saying itself. In the whole working of Jesus before and *after* His Resurrection there is manifestly a continual upward progression; so that according to Acts i. 1, all that was accomplished in the flesh and upon earth was but the *beginning* with reference to the new commencement at Pentecost.

We must carefully mark, preparatorily to the whole discourse, that ἔργα here passes far beyond the narrow notion of mere σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα. The miracles, in their more restricted sense, are only the beginning and symbol of His proper works; it is not of the former that the Lord speaks merely, but His ἵνα ὑμεῖς θαυμάζητε extends onwards to the amazement of the judged at the last day, the transport of those raised to eternal life; in these first sentences all is grandly summed up and announced, that is to be pursued into subsequent detail in the discourse. Again, however, we may apply the words, their sense being so comprehensive, to the miracles themselves; and then, without making the ἵνα to be ἐκβατικὸν, they seem to say:—This is the first aim of the miracles, to excite in those who behold them a wholesome marvelling, so that proceeding from them to the still greater which are to come it may further be said—μὴ θαυμάζετε τοῦτο, ver. 28. Comp. chap. vii. 21; Acts iii. 12.

Ver. 21. If, as is quite right, we hold fast the connection of these words with the event which had just occurred, with the ταῦτα proceeding from which the μείζονα are pointed to, then we have the very simple meaning at once—Not merely the healing of the sick, but the *raising of the dead.* When we go a verse further, and find the *judgment* immediately following, it appears plain that both these regalia Dei are in their most universal comprehensiveness attributed to the Son. (God was called, in the beginning, the Judge of all the earth, Gen. xviii. 25, comp. Ps. cv. 7; and Jas. iv. 12 refers to Him alone all saving and destroying. Similarly He alone can kill and make alive—see, *e.g.*, Deut. xxxii. 39; 1 Sam. ii. 6; 2 Kings v. 7.) It is most pitiable, however, to find the best commentators interpolating—Greater works, *as examples* of the resurrection and judgment. For these two works are not merely the *greatest* simply, but they

are in fact, though but few observe it, the *inclusive summary* of all Divine working. There is absolutely no work of God which is not either a producing, sustaining, restoring *Quickening*,[1] or a deciding, rejecting, destroying *Judgment;* and the goal of all these works is the full manifestation of their great result at the last day. The dualism corresponds immediately to omnipotence and omniscience; and then, more profoundly still, to *Love* which works in omnipotence, and to *Right* which omnisciently tests and decides the state of everything. This is indisputably true; and so far the word of Jesus concerning ζωοποιεῖν includes in its principle all quickening energy in nature and humanity, and, indeed, in the whole world. But to expound it of this *pre-eminently* is manifestly incorrect; for, the meaning which the word would suggest first to those who heard it must be the *first* meaning. Proceeding from individual raisings of the dead (according to our harmony the daughter of Jairus, and the widow's son at Nain, had both experienced this already, and hence it is not ζωοποιήσει), and promising more and more public examples (as in the case of Lazarus), the Lord's word embraces here in one the bodily and the spiritual sense, in order that He may afterwards, vers. 25 and 28, separate them, and dwell upon each of them individually. The ζωοποιεῖν after ἐγείρειν is only a progression in the significant expression; it is not that the former is negative ("to scare away death!"), and the latter positive; for the quickening from death manifestly includes already the impartation of life.

"The *spiritual* energy of the Son, as quickening, life-imparting, and life-sustaining," or rather life-restoring, becomes special subject of discourse first at ver. 24; it is so closely wrapped up in our present passage that the Jews, who expected in their Messiah the Raiser of the dead, would and could evidently think of the physical miracle alone. But it is not correct to assign, with Lange, a *threefold* progression to the discourse on this subject; regarding this at first as referring *only* to the "*miraculous energy* of Christ during His sojourn upon earth upon *individual cases*"[2]—so that He preliminarily "quickens only *some* whom

[1] Even the Creation falls under the same category, according to Rom. iv. 17.

[2] And above with a refinement of generality:—As the Father exerts a

He chooses out, in restoring to them their soundness;"—then afterwards that He quickens many by His preached Gospel; and finally all men. For τοὺς νεκρούς stands here at the very beginning; and taking into account the full and absolute tone of the ἐγείρειν τοὺς νεκρούς as it primarily fell upon the ears of those who heard it, we cannot put upon the following οὓς θέλει anything like an electing or restricting meaning. Rather has it a designed *extensiveness* of meaning, opposing (as Lücke says) all Jewish exclusiveness—Not merely Israel, but Gentiles throughout all the world. But the most simple sense which the words bear is, to our feeling, that of a strong intimation that the Son, *like the Father*, in His own independent power, quickens by a will which can never fail of its purpose.[1] *Because* He will, and *if* He will, He also can; and this, asserted at first with such an emphatic generality, admits of a manifold application and reference. It distinguishes between those isolated quickenings of the dead which individual prophets obtained from God in wrestling prayer, from the spontaneous and immediate —*I say unto thee, arise! Come forth!* which we find in the resurrections of the Son. We must understand His οὓς θέλει and ὅπου θέλει in relation to all His miraculous acts and working generally, in the same sense as that in which He so speaks concerning the Spirit, ch. iii. 8. He thereby majestically intimates to us, as far as He is speaking of the bodily dead, that as it regarded His *power*, it were a light thing to Him to awaken all the dead instead of any one individual—if His wisdom could have *willed* it in harmony with His Father's will. And, finally, He thereby tells us—if *we* may give a prospective application to the spiritually dead—that He seeks indeed the salvation and life of all, but that He *wills* only the life of those who *believe* on Him, according to the sacred right and the fundamental nature of the case. *This* is the only limitation which is to be found in the expression; it is not, however, the restriction of absolute decree —but with Him as with the Father.—All that He wills He can,

manifold, endless energy in giving life to the dead throughout the world, for example, by the fountain of Bethesda, so is it also the Son's delight to quicken and diffuse life everywhere!

[1] Bengel: Nunquam ejus voluntatem destituit effectus. And this is also predicated of God. (Ps. cxv. 3; Dan. iv. 32.)

but He cannot *will* everything. Here we find the transition to judging, and the connection between quickening and judgment.[1]

Ver. 22. For it is assuredly in the κρίσις, as the γάρ shows, that we are to find the ground and the explanation of the οὓς θέλει. If, on the one hand, the visible quickenings of the dead as signs of the power and dignity of the Son of man gave *proof* that He was appointed to be Judge of the quick and dead, and therefore that He might truly testify this of Himself; so, on the other hand, *more profoundly understood*, this proof approves itself as it points to the judgment which has already taken place in the quickening itself. Only let us apprehend both these pregnant ideas of the Divine working in their entire fulness and depth, as they are intended to be understood here, and as is indicated in the τὴν κρίσιν πᾶσαν which introduces the latter of them! That is not merely the final judgment at the end of the world, which comes forward afterwards in ver. 27, but the entire deciding, separating, and excluding process which, as the preparation for the great winding up, goes on in, and in connection with, the beginnings of the process of quickening. The κρίσις is not merely (according to Ebrard) the withholding of life (least of all in the predestinarian sense); nor is it merely (according to Schleiermacher) the distinguishing between the earlier and the later, the selection of what shall now be quickened from what shall be progressively quickened down to the πάντες of ver. 28; but it is, at the same time, no other than the merciful judgment of the Spirit, in order to the cutting off of sin, which cannot be pretermitted even to believers for their salvation's sake. When in ver. 24 the more restricted idea of spiritual quickening comes forward, then, as the contrast, the κρίσις also is referred, in a more restricted sense, to condemnation and exclusion from life.

It is almost self-evident, further, that in this compressed discourse, which is not unfolded in a strictly logical form, the Lord

[1] If we were, with many, to lay emphasis upon the connection of οὓς θέλει with ζωοποιεῖν alone, and not with ἐγείρειν, there might be found a profound truth in such a position of the word. But this only holds good in the deeper meaning of ζωοποιεῖν; and it does not exclude the fact, that even then the Lord raised from bodily death whom He would, and because He would.

does not design to say that the Father judgeth no man absolutely. He is continuing His former manner of speech, and following up His former *words*—"Even as He *immediately* quickeneth no man; but *both*, as all His works, only through the Son." Thus we may translate οὐδέ—So also not, or, Even not. But it is wisely and designedly so expressed, since it might be said that the Father quickeneth the Son according to His humanity, but judgeth Him in no sense at all. He hath *committed* to the Son all judgment, that is (with Calvin), *the entire work*, the *ruling* and *ordering* of His kingdom (so that in this sense even the raising and quickening are included in it), its whole prerogative and power—which expression now fills up the meaning of the previous "showing," and probably contains an allusion to Ps. lxxii. 1–4.

What is the end and aim of this committal to the Son—which indeed involves no retirement on the part of the Father, but is the most essential manifestation of Himself in His own express image and likeness? The *honour* of the Father in the Son! As the world was first created that the glory of the eternal Son might be shown forth in it, so is the same end contemplated in the entire redemption of fallen man. The καθώς, taken alone, does not, indeed, constrain us to interpret this of a strict equality of Divine honour—any more than the ἐστί in the institution of the Lord's Supper proves the mystery—but it is most evident throughout the whole discourse, from its beginning to its end, that it speaks of nothing less. If the Father doeth nothing without the Son, if the Son *works* in all things even as the Father, then it follows in essential fitness that equality of honour must be the consequence of equality of working, yea, that unity of honour must be the consequence of unity of working.[1] And this is the very meaning of the next clause; which goes on to add that the honour of the Son, severed from the honour of the Father, is not to be thought of, just as if it should say—For the Father will and can no otherwise be honoured. Pfenninger says that this "holds good even of those who are sent by a King with full credentials;" but this, though well intended, demands infinitely too

[1] Reference has been rightly made to Hos. iii. 5, where the term of Divine honour דרשׁ is used both of the Lord their God, and of David their king.

little, for here there is more than the mission of a Representative for a limited time. Baumgarten-Crusius lets his Rationalism appear in that most arbitrary saying—"but the honour of the Son is *not* the honour paid to His *person*, but to His *relation and work*;" we who believe know, however, and not only we but the Rationalists themselves know it well enough in their secret conscience, that there is no relation and work of Jesus *apart from* His *Person*. He has said it and He will make it good; He will so reign and rule that *all* shall finally be constrained to honour Him as Lord, even those who till then have refused that honour—either as the Lord who raiseth to eternal life, or as the Judge who doometh to everlasting damnation. Even in the earlier Old-Testament dispensation it was cared for and so ordered, that no one could long conscientiously worship a God and Father of the world, without acknowledging Him in the Jehovah, the God of Israel, consequently also in Christ, the fulfilment of the old covenant, the Son of the Father. The question is not here of those who know Him not; the *μὴ τιμῶν τὸν υἱὸν* is only he who *denies his honour* to Him who is *sent* to him, as the manifested and attested Son. Sincere heathens unconsciously honour the Son, whose light faintly shines into their darkness; Christians who *oppose themselves* to the living God, to Him who testifies Himself as the Father of Jesus Christ, undermine the testimony of the Son concerning Himself and the Father by taking away the Old Testament, and yet would retain the Father still—like the modern Jews who have stolen that name from us;—but the progressive error of such doctrines of lies has been but too often made manifest and mourned over, as it is described in 1 Jno. ii. 23; 2 Jno. 9.[1] "They begin by opposing Jehovah, and end with the *système de la nature*" (Joh. v. Müller). Neither do they succeed, finally, who, like Herder formerly, would separate the eternal Son, idealistically understood, from Jesus the Son of man; against which Kleuker has well written: "We cannot see how it is possible to bestow upon Jesus Christ the Son of God, an honour which should not and may

[1] And that which Origen (de princ. 1, 2, 10) expressed as the only possible trinitarian *speculative* knowledge of God—Pater non potest esse quis si filius non sit.

not be bestowed upon Him as the Son of man; since in truth neither this Son of man apart from the Son of God, nor the Son of God apart from the Son of man, has to us any subsistence." We shall in the process of the discourse which we now enter upon find superabundant assurance of the inseparable unity of the Son of God and the Son of man. Jesus the Son of man is no Saint, to whom we, like good Catholics, offer an invocatory worship, distinguished from prayer; but God is manifest in that flesh which His eternal Son has assumed, and the same God who will not give His honour to another, nor His praise to graven images (Isa. xlii. 8), *has* in fact and indeed in giving all His works over as the Father to the Son *given* to Him all His honour likewise—and He will *require* it! He will make the enemies of His Son His footstool!

Ver. 24. In this second "Verily, verily, I say unto you"—out of which a third immediately afterwards springs—begins the strengthening *confirmation* of the lofty assertions to which the Son had given utterance, and the clear exhibition of the grounds upon which they rested. From ver. 30 onwards the *testimony* for the conviction of *unbelief* is made prominent; but now a *demonstration* is specifically promised in order to attract *faith*, the *experimental evidence* to be enjoyed internally now and externally hereafter. He who by faith gives to the Son, and so to the Father in the Son, His honour, *experiences in the full sense, to his own salvation*, the two greatest, all-comprehending and distinctive works of the Son:—the dead *live* in the full meaning of the word, having even now eternal life; and they come not into the judgment of condemnation, but ever stand in the *judgment of the Son of man*, in the full meaning of *that* word; that is, under the judgment of His mercy and grace.

Here could not have been substituted—He that beholdeth My works. For although the works of Christ, Matt. xi. 2, 5, even after the term of His manifestation in the flesh, are ever more and more wonderfully exhibited in the history of the world and of the church; and although once afterwards, ch. vi. 40, the *seeing* of the Son stands for the recognition and acknowledgment of His personal dignity, it is nevertheless true that with respect to the universal experience of believers from age to age, the hearing of His *word* is the great test and condition. All the words which

He spake, and which He has been pleased to transmit to us in such a manner that in reading we may hear them, and much more in *hearing* may read them, are one great word; and every individual word which I truly accept may be to my faith an introduction to the whole fulness of His teaching. The ἀκούειν receives from the appended πιστεύειν the pregnant sense of a genuine hearing in the obedience of faith—and such also is the meaning of οἱ ἀκούσαντες in ver. 25. "In this hearing begins man's agency in his awakening (that is, susceptibility for awakening impression), in faith it ends," says Fikenscher half truly; for as it regards its ending with faith, it must never be forgotten that the faith which must mature towards finished fidelity never reaches its end below.[1] But it is observable that our Lord does not use here the customary πιστεύων εἰς ἐμέ, but instead thereof τῷ πέμψαντί με. This is not to be merely resolved into—He who believeth that I am sent of the Father (ch. xvi. 27, 28, xvii. 8), in my Mission, in God as having sent Me, —but it once more brings into high prominence the complete oneness between the Father and the Son, just as His final words to the Jews declare it, ch. xii. 44;—He that believeth in Me, believeth not on Me (as a man, independent of and another than God), but on the Father in Me. Finally, it is in the utmost condescension that the Father Himself, to be believed in Christ, is placed *in the dative*, just as a man might be worthy to be believed; for this is the majesty at once and the grace of the testimony of God, that it is victoriously convincing, and yet ranks itself only as if it were the highest of human testimonies. See and mark attentively in relation to this, 1 Jno. v. 9, 10. Here also, as in that chapter vers. 11–13, follows the assured inward witness confirming and sealing the faith which is put forth; the mighty power of God in the bestowment of a new life, which is itself a resurrection (Eph. i. 19, 20), yea, the true and complete resurrection of man dead in sins; whereas, without this internal principle and beginning of life, the bodily resurrection itself will but reveal and consummate the work of

[1] With all honour to the word of the Apostle, 2 Tim. iv. 7 (which, however, plainly hangs on ver. 6, and is not for our imitation), the truth remains as we have set it forth on Lu. xviii. 8, in the fourth volume of this work.

death. The ἔχειν ζωὴν αἰώνιον, without the article, already approaches the idea of ver. 26.

But what shall we say of the not coming into judgment? We have already in a preparatory way of explanation given our acceptation of the word. We might by various philological means extract its meaning, not, however, without leaving some kind of κρίσις remaining even for believers. Many have laid stress upon the ἔρχεσθαι εἰς, with allusion to the prayer against temptation:—he comes not so deeply into condemnation as to remain in it, and no more to come out. This is the most artificial method, and quite inconsistent with the analogy of Scripture and scriptural language. For the whole expression is ordered with reference to human notions, as referring to the coming before a tribunal where first the decision is made between right and wrong. Thus Deut. xxv. 1 (προσέλθωσιν εἰς κρ.), Job ix. 32 (ἔλθωμεν ὁμοθυμαδόν.) If it be said that we shall indeed all stand *before* the judgment-seat for the revelation of our character (2 Cor. v. 10), but that this is not a coming *into* judgment, since the decision is not then first judicially made, but the ancient absolution only confirmed and rendered final;—then we can only reply that the phraseology here is directly opposed to this sense, and that the same might be said of the damned, since the condemnation already passed upon their unbelief, chap. iii. 18, is no more than confirmed and consummated. We would express the meaning thus: —He cometh not any more, any further, into *any other* judgment than that merciful judgment of the word and Spirit upon his sin, under which he has already placed himself in hearing and believing the truth. Ver. 30. That is quite in harmony with the matter itself; and, thus exhibited, we may found upon it the simple assumption that the Lord *now* as in chap. iii. 17, 18 takes κρίσις from the comprehensive idea of it given in ver. 22, and uses it in a more restricted sense (Erasmus: in condemnationem). And this more restricted sense of the same phrase occurs throughout the earlier Scriptures in those passages which speak of the being brought to judgment, with guilt presupposed and doom assured; for instance in אַל־תָּבוֹא בְמִשְׁפָּט Ps. cxliii. 2 (μὴ εἰσέλθῃς), יָבִיאֲךָ Eccles. xi. 9, although in Eccles. xii. 14 it passes over into the more general signification again. Thus the words coincide most impressively with the

epexegesis which follows:—Because he hath life through believing he cometh naturally no more into that condemnation *of death*, in which he lay, and from which he hath been drawn forth.[1] The present ἔρχεται (which Nonnus has diluted into ἵξεται), with its fulness of promise and encouragement, is followed by the ampler μεταβέβηκεν, which must not be perverted into the future *transiet* of the Vulgate, but is no less than the full and pregnant perfect, as we find it again in 1 John iii. 14. It is the transition to the καὶ νῦν ἐστι of the following verse, and θάνατος obviously means ex vi oppositi that inward, spiritual death of the sinful soul, which is the true death in death, and without which the mere physical dying were no death at all. Chap. xi. 25, 26. When the one decisive *step* has been taken in *faith*, and the great transition effected (that step, however, as the Berlenb. Bib. remarks is not a *leap*), all the rest follows surely, with the resurrection of life.[2] These μεταβεβηκότες are the true "Hebrews" —and this allusion to the mystical meaning of עִבְרִי we would rather accept with the child-like "triflers," whom the Lord condescends often thus to "trifle" with, than the allusio ad typum hujus rei, *i.e.*, pascha which Grotius after Augustine maintains, or even Lampe's reference to the עבר between the two pieces in the כרת ברית.

Ver. 25. Every believer at least, who looks at the connection with what has preceded, must—having himself passed from death unto life—apply a spiritual signification to these words also, and without hesitation regard them as describing an internal resurrection. But the expressions here used being so similar to those of vers. 28, 29, expositors have been much divided upon this point; and their divisions have made the exposition of this chapter one of the most fruitful in warnings that the history of exegesis furnishes. Men have rushed to both extremes with needless contention, simply because they will not understand the *combination* of the internal and external in the teaching of the Holy Ghost: and it is hard to say which is the more arbi-

[1] Wesley thinks it necessary to add—Unless he make shipwreck of the faith. But this is needless here, since in πιστεύων the perseverance of faith unto the end is presupposed.

[2] Not vivificatio fidem antecedit (!), but ipse fides est transitio i.e. acceptio vivificationis.

trary, to understand in ver. 25 only a bodily resurrection, or in vers. 28, 29 only the previous spiritual quickening of all believers. The latter *seems* the worse, but the former is bad enough. Assuredly, in ver. 21, the Lord had spoken to the Jews with such plain reference to their Messiah-expectation, that they could not otherwise than understand Him of a bodily resurrection; but how can we suppose that *He* would speak continually of the External, without having in His thought the Internal which lies at its foundation, and which in everything external is either shadowed forth or plainly revealed; and how can we suppose that He would not lead His hearers in that direction? Even the Spirit in the prophets applies it thus (we find it so used in Isa. xxix. 18, xxxv. 5, 6, lxi. 1, 2);[1] in Ezek. xxxvii. the resurrection of Israel has this application; and surely the Lord Himself would still more distinctively bring it into prominence. Again, as we cannot accept the great symbolical pledge in Ezek. xxxvii. as figuring something actual by something unreal, and which could not be literally possible; but must regard it as pointing to that real resurrection which is openly announced in Isa. xxvi. 19, and Dan. xii. 2; so shall we find it here—The real and external resurrection is not simply *supposed* in this most open testimony, but is further expressly announced in the subsequent declaration of vers. 28, 29.

"Yea verily, I am He whom ye wait for, the Son of God, the Raiser of the dead—thus begins the Lord anew with His third Amen, Amen—but I have told you before, and now tell you again, that this quickening of the dead by the voice of My word begins now in the souls of believers; and *that* is the true Resurrection of *life*, without which there can be none in any future time." We cannot understand how Olshausen can make good his assertion that "the formula ἔρχεται ὥρα καὶ νῦν ἐστιν cannot be used concerning spiritual resurrection, for this is supposed to be already effected and present;" it is as if he had never read the strictly analogous word of ch. iv. 23. Yet all the quickening, and all the life of the few who believed in Jesus at that time, was indeed only the faint beginning, it was scarcely

[1] And it could not be otherwise, compare our observations upon Matt. xi. Vol. ii.

indeed the bursting germ of that full power of life which only after Pentecost came and still comes into the death of all the world, Jews and Gentiles alike (Eph. ii. 1; Ps. cxv. 8). The article in *οἱ νεκροί* attaches itself immediately to the previous *τοῦ θανάτου*; indeed all the expressions here are significantly chosen *differently* from ver. 28. There is even some meaning in the fact that here it is the voice *of the Son of God* which is made emphatically prominent, while there in connection with this it is the voice of the Son of man appearing for final judgment; for it is only faith that can now discern the voice of the Son of God who calleth. But more important, and indeed decisive, is the *καὶ οἱ ἀκούσαντες* which is added; for this brings out that actual limitation and election which was dimly expressed in *οὓς θέλει*, that election which depends upon faith. (Almost as if it had been said instead—*οἱ θέλοντες* comp. ver. 40.) To understand this as a mere corroborating repetition—And as, even as soon as, they hear, they shall all live[1]—is altogether inappropriate. Baumgarten-Crusius remarks here very acutely and correctly that it is not *καὶ ἀκούσαντες*, the *article* intervening takes out a certain number of those who hear, those namely who hear aright; so that the *ἀκούειν* has a different meaning in the two clauses—the voice is heard by all, some among them accept and yield to its call. *This* was prepared for by *ἀκούων καὶ πιστεύων*, ver. 24, and in ch. x. 26, 27, we find the same saying in the same sense. The *πάντες* of ver. 28 afterwards is something very different from this. That the *λόγος* is now called a *φωνή* is not the least bar to our understanding the passage of a spiritual resurrection, although Olshausen strangely maintains that it should be: for *φωνή* is essentially distinguished from *λόγος*, and is here, as ver. 29 shows, no other than the creating voice which calls the dead to life! Does not *φωνή* belong necessarily to the figure so-called (rather most absolute reality), according to which the quickening of believers is termed a resurrection? Is not the Lord's word at least, when He calls us into life, an awakening voice, the cry of omnipotent creation

[1] Grotius: Et illi, simul atque audierint, vivent, ne quis audientes a non audientibus putet distingui! Or as others: So suddenly do the dead arise, that quickened in the twinkling of an eye, they may be said to hear the voice!

to the inner man, lying in his death? (Eph. v. 14.) Olshausen artificially supplies—*οἱ ἀκούσαντες*, scil. *τὸν λόγον*, those who earlier in their life-time *had heard*, and thus are prepared and capable of recognising the *φωνή*; and in harmony with this interpretation understands the *καὶ νῦν ἐστιν*, with many others, of a *first* resurrection of believers already beginning when Christ appeared, and since secretly going on. But however true and harmonious with Scripture this first resurrection may be, the Lord is not speaking now publicly of such a mystery; a mystery so essentially different from the expected resurrection of Israel in the Messiah's reign: He cannot be supposed to have had allusion to that, and His hearers could not have so understood His reign. The first resurrection includes, on the one hand, according to Matt. xxvii. 52, some who had never heard the word of Christ in life; and, on the other hand, not all who were His believing people. But the expressions here used are inapplicable in either case. Finally, we cannot admit any reference in these words to those preliminary, individual resurrections, which took place as signs of the time that was coming. Ver. 21 did in some degree connect itself with them, and the *πάντες* of ver. 28 points back to them again by way of contrast; but here between the two the *οἱ νεκροὶ* stands prominently first,—not individual dead, surely, but all who were constrained outwardly to hear the voice, though only a few would rightly and inwardly hear. The Lord *appeals* to this *hearing* and *willing*, which are followed by the internal experimental evidence of the true resurrection; and He further *calls* in order to produce them; and this is the *kernel* of His whole testimony—He that hath ears to hear, let him hear! All who suffer themselves to hear the awakening voice, *shall live:* this future now taking the place of the *ἔχειν* and *μεταβεβηκέναι* is a necessary complement of the sense, since the life received by believers at the outset is to go on progressively even to the consummate *ζήσονται* of the bodily resurrection also unto life—which is not to be excluded here as the ultimate goal. But what this *ζωή* in its *ground and principle* really is, we learn from the following verse, which is strictly connected with this:—the life in God and from God communicated by the Son.

Ver. 26. With God is the fountain of life, מְקוֹר חַיִּים, Ps. xxxvi.

10; Jer. ii. 13. He hath life ἐν ἑαυτῷ and ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ. This His *Aseitas*, Αὐτοουσία, which is necessarily implied in the idea of God, is not so much asserted here as presupposed in the ὥσπερ, in order to tell us, that He communicates this His life through the Son, who like the Father is the independent fountain of life for us. Not as if we were obliged to translate simply —ζωὴν, that is, the vivifying power, though the clause tends also to that in its connection. It would not be proper here, as in the following sentence, to say—ἐξουσίαν ζωῆς ἔδωκε, for the life of God is in itself already a vivifying power (ἐξουσία ζωογονεῖν, as Theophylact says), and it should be carefully emphasized that the Son like the Father hath life ἐν ἑαυτῷ, is Himself *the life*. (Ch. i. 4, xi. 25; 1 Jno. v. 20.) Notwithstanding, He hath not as the *Son* life ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ like the Father, but from the Father; this trinitarian relation ad intra is an immoveable boundary of definition in the well-measured words. Ὁ υἱὸς is here as everywhere the Son of God and the Son of man in the inseparable unity of both natures, and the ἔδωκε resolves itself into a twofold sense:—it applies to the eternal Son before time was, and He thereby most expressly declares Himself to be the *Firstborn* before every *creature*, inasmuch as the creature can have life only ἐν θεῷ; and as it respects the Son of man it is a yet more proper giving, as we find in Matt. xxviii. 18, but that was only rendered possible by His being the Son of God. The solution of the apparent contradiction between ἔδωκεν and ἐν ἑαυτῷ is to be sought in the incomprehensible mystery of the Father and the Son: we shall not pause, however, to dwell upon that, but proceed with the discourse, which now passes over to our humanity, and speaks words pertaining to man's salvation.

Ver. 27. In this verse is finally summed up all that the Lord might say concerning the two great works of God, Quickening and Judging, in the strict oneness of their twofold character. The words are simple and plain for the first investigation of a rightly disposed mind, but they involve the whole unfathomable depth of the connection and relation between those two Divine works from the Creation to the final Judgment, as they proceed ever in and by the Son. Their entire consummation alone will bring us to an adequate knowledge of their true harmony; now

we can only study them in a very rudimentary way. Christ gives *life* as the eternal *Son of God*, and He was from the beginning of things the principle and source of life to all creatures; but He *judgeth* as the *Son of man*, that is the end of God's dealings with fallen man upon earth. It is clear from the antithesis with ver. 26, that this most strikingly significant ὅτι υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἐστι[1] without any article is designed to make emphatic His humanity. Allowing that the expression may contain a reference to Dan. vii. 13, 14, we must assume that there also בַּר אֱנָשׁ is used with especial relation to His mediatorial oneness with humanity, and there is no reason for understanding *here*—"because He is the Messiah." This, in such a connection, would be a meaningless addition, instead of that very deep thought which is in the expression, though short-sighted expositors too often pass it over. Von Meyer's note deserves respectful consideration: "because man should be judged by his fellow, by the most gracious and the meekest man, by man who hath borne the sins of mankind, and can have compassion upon his brethren—so that it is Mercy itself which judgeth." This is, verily, the judgment of the Son of Man! He has Himself fought, if not with sin in Himself, yet with the sin of the world, and conquered; He knows by the experience of His own infirmity in the flesh, the precise boundary line between that which is inseparable from humanity and sinless, and that which is truly guilt; He hath exercised the most perfect compassion towards His brethren, the members of His own body, before the judgment and in order to turn away its sentence; and when the last judgment comes He will consummate that mercy in His believing people, by that final forgiveness without which even then not one of them could stand. He will then be a merciful and gracious Judge to His own, towards all whom He can recognise in that character. But he to whom this *normal and central Man, in whom all the history of mankind is representatively summed up*, can then judicially say—"I know thee not, because thou wouldst never know Me," will be with that purest justice

[1] On the incorrect reference of this to ver. 28, see Lücke S. 61, 62, and Lampe ad h. l. Comp. also Brückner on de Wette at this passage, who allows force to the omission of the article, but then forgets it in a weak and superficial interpretation.

which love will still and ever retain, *condemned.*[1] A Son of man the Judge of all the world, as God! This is the offence of blinded minds; but the Lord's words go forth to prevent it—Rejoice ye rather that the Father hath committed to His Son *as the Son of man* the judgment of you all!

This utterance reaches forward even to the great day when the κρίσιν ποιεῖν will be finally accomplished; but ver. 30 will teach us that, if we would then stand before this Son of man with acceptance, we must submit ourselves to His merciful judgment even now in this present time. All who believe, hearing now His voice, know in their own experience that the Son of God giveth eternal life, and that the Son of man compassionately judgeth—"I condemn thee not;" and both combine in the beginning to give assurance which the glorious future will confirm:—"A very different doom awaits the unbeliever!"

Vers. 28, 29. "Then did the Jews *marvel* at this unheard of doctrine, and even the Scribes and Pharisees appeared to be hurried away by the overpowering current of His words, forgetting for a while their hatred and their scorn, and standing in *amazement.*" Teschendorff. But He seizes upon this their astonishment, and goes on to utter that sublime and serene μὴ θαυμάζετε which was yet more wonderful than what He had said before. Τοῦτο naturally means what had just been said:—Marvel not at this merely, rather believe, and thus experience unto salvation how I, the Son, as Son of man, judge, and give from God the life of God; for every man who abides till that day in *unbelieving* amazement, who hath been offended in Me, will *then be constrained* to experience that I have testified the truth. Few among you now hear My voice aright; but then shall *all*, those too who have been long in their *graves* (what, and wheresoever their graves unknown to man may be), be *compelled* to hear it! And then shall be the final and eternal decision, when all *come forth* and are revealed. Then shall there be to believers a judgment also unto life, to unbelievers a new life unto judgment

[1] Being Himself the principle of life in humanity, He can in the most perfect manner *distinguish* between men who are quickened to eternal life, and those who are fallen into death. So Lange very truly, but not sufficingly—the idea of judgment which it indicates being too restricted.

The unbelievers shall be *awakened*, but not to the *life* of the Son of God; *judged*, but not with that merciful judgment of the Son of man which had been offered in vain before. And then shall there be the *voice* heard—Come forth! as it was prophetically heard at the grave of Lazarus. The Lord refers almost literally to Dan. xii. 2; but He extends, in πάντες, what there more immediately points by רַבִּים to a first resurrection, into a universality of final resurrection. For ἀνάστασις ζωῆς compare also ἀνάστασις εἰς ζωήν, 2 Macc. vii. 14. It is indeed true that He mentions the *works* first of all as judicial signs of faith or unbelief, and so far those who have done good are those who have persisted in faith and in the new life thereby received; those who have done evil are those who have persisted in unbelief or relapsed into it. But as the Lord Himself, in Matt. xxv. (see our exposition, Vol. iii.) teaches us, and so also the rest of Scripture, that there will be some who had never learned to know the *name* and *person* of the Lord Jesus (although they experienced in themselves the distinctive energy of the Logos), we are led to a profounder consideration of the reason why the Lord here, as in Rev. xx. 12, 13, mentions the works instead of faith or unbelief.[1] If those who had been partakers of a first resurrection already enjoyed the restoration also of physical life, so, on the other hand, the heathens, mercifully accepted, receive by the first immediate voice of the Lord which *they* now hear, the full life of the inner man:—the resurrection itself is their regeneration, just as to those who will be found alive and not come forth from their graves, their change will be a resurrection. Thus does the sacred word, even where it is not speaking directly of these and such like mysteries, yet leave room for them, if we collect together in one all that is afterwards said. Thus it may be understood how, in this special sense, the resurrection is to many a resurrection *of life*,—to

[1] We do not too literally understand here a consciously developed faith or unbelief in His person! My critic, Münchmeyer, who terms this position a false one, has entirely misunderstood me, for I do not by any means deny the value of works only as a proof of the internal state. That, nevertheless, the performance of good works "is dependent upon faith in the Redeemer," even where His word has not been received, Schleiermacher has rightly perceived, however otherwise erroneous his view of the last judgment may be. S. 360, 361 of his Homilies on St John.

convict and put to shame those to whom life was once offered in vain, and to whom the resurrection is now *of damnation* alone. Against Schleiermacher's trifling remark—we cannot, in the face of the solemn Scripture, find any better word for it—that there cannot be a resurrection into eternal death, since all condition of unbelief must pass away for ever, and that the resurrection, as the great severance, is not yet the full accomplishment of all God's will, every man, however much he may desire an Apocatastasis eternally proceeding, or accomplished at the last day, may find his defence in Matt. xxv. 46, and the current of the whole Scripture. The Lord does indeed *mean* in opposito a resurrection *of death*, but He does not expressly so term it, partly because such an ὀξύμωρον would savour too much of the bitterness of contempt in the lips of Him whose love is now bent only on winning all, and is therefore withheld; partly because in the whole circle of the ideas of this discourse *life* and *judgment* are uniformly antithetical.[1]

Ver. 30. Here begins the second part of this discourse. After the Lord has, consistently with His own dignity, *vindicated* Himself, though by only stronger and stronger assertion of His Divine works, He now proceeds, in a certain sense, to give *evidence*. It is not so much, however, evidence, as a *reproof of their unbelief* appended to it, their unbelief being condemned by the collected body of *witnesses* in their progression and unity; just as the self-evidencing *works* were previously held forth for their condemnation, which thus themselves in reality coincide with the testimonies. For in Divine things there is for man no other evidence for conviction than this ἔλεγχος πραγμάτων for the opening of the eye of faith. We shall see that the several testimonies to which the Lord appeals are esteemed by Him to be but one connected *testimony of the Father*, and that in conjunction with His own *self-testimony*.

We see this at once when our Lord, at the outset of the proving part of His discourse (as it is improperly called), only *repeats* this first assertion at ver. 19. We may exhibit the arrangement of thought thus:—as He has hitherto defended the first matter

[1] As also the Jews distinguish between תְּחִיָּה and תְּקוּמָה, see Buxt. lex. Rabb. p. 745.

of accusation, the ταῦτα ποιεῖν ἐν σαββάτῳ, the λύειν τὸ σάββατον, His ἐργάζεσθαι, and that only by the λέγειν, which is repeated against the second greater accusation, that He was the Son of God—so He now defends this λέγειν itself specifically, in still continuing it, now however placing *His* λόγος in conjunction with *every* λόγος *of the Father*, which the Jews had already received (ver. 38). He has hitherto spoken of the Son, the Son of man standing before them, in the *third person* (with the exception of ver. 24, in connection with that most central λέγω ὑμῖν); He now begins and continues to give full prominence to the *first person* of His κἀγώ. Thus He repeats, first of all, in ver. 30, the declaration from which He set out in ver. 19. But this second οὐδέν now more distinctly embraces all that has preceded, from the Sabbath-work which they had blamed to the judgment of the last day; He retires back again, as it were appeasingly after the great declaration of vers. 28, 29, to the position of subordination to the Father, and connects directly His *now proceeding* word and judgment with His final judicial utterances. As I *do* nothing of Myself, so also I *speak* nothing of Myself—that is the progress of the thought. But He terms His speaking to the world a *judging*, in immediate conjunction with the final *judgment* just mentioned (comp. afterwards ch. viii. 25, 26); and thereby declares two things, confirmatory of our previous exposition of the comprehensive and frequent κρίσις—not only that the judgment of unbelievers already begins in His spoken word (ch. xii. 48), but also that believers are similarly required to submit their sins to the present judgment of His merciful word. Before it was—What I *see*, I do; now it is—As I *hear*, I judge and speak. That is—I hear of the Father, consequently always aright; consequently My judgment is always right, always just, yea it is the only unerringly sure judgment of Divine truth, which is revealed in My person to mankind. Let it be remembered that in Isa. xi. 3, 4, this judging in righteousness is exhibited as the first great official work of the future Messiah. It is there negatively declared that He shall not see and hear after the manner of men,[1]

[1] Since the most upright judge, not being omniscient, can only judge according to what he hears and sees in the most unprejudiced manner

and that is one and the same with this positive assertion that He hears rightly from the Father. And here rises to us, when we view it more generally, another twofold distinction:—"If I judge you, your sin, your unbelief, the pride of your hearts (as then was to be the case), I judge you justly; if I arrogate to Myself the authority for this, that I am the Son, the Saviour, and Judge of mankind, I do not unjustly appropriate anything to Myself. For the Father Himself in Me commands Me, in My inmost being, to declare to all the world *that I am He.*" This is in sublime analogy with the humble appeal of the Apostles to what the Lord and His Spirit had shown and testified to them, Acts iv. 19, 20. Comp. John viii. 55.

This might have been enough. But the Lord yet more deeply and graciously condescends to us, when He goes on to add—*because I seek not Mine own will, but the will of Him who hath sent Me!* (πατρός is probably not the right reading). This sinlessness, this pure freedom from self, this living, moving, and having His being in the love of God (vers. 41, 42) as the fulfilling of the law, may and should be seen from without by the world; these are His ἔργα in the highest sense of the word, wherein, through the unity of His entire sacred action and life, all His individual wonderful works attest their divinity. As He did no sin, so was there no deceit found in His mouth—this is the great conclusion which He sets before us here, as in ch. viii. 46; though the Rationalists down to our own day have never understood it. He asserts here, as in ch. viii. 28, 29, His perfect *sinlessness*, and appeals *to that* as evidence, that in this inseparable unity of His whole Person, as He stands before us judging all alike, all His miracles are attested to be Divine works, and the sum of His declarations concerning Himself and us, δίκαιον and ἀληθές. For ἁμαρτία as sin and as error is essentially one. Sin is the acting from self, error and lie the speaking from self, in opposition to God; and as the Son with perfect ὁμοθέλησις *seeketh* nothing but the Father's will, that is, only lives for its fulfilment (a condescending expression in antithesis with our-

possible. And the *hearing* is placed distinctively before the κρίνειν κατ' ὄψιν (John vii. 24) in προσωπολημψίᾳ (which does not befit *blind* justice). The Lord, however, needs not first to question and examine men, for He hath heard all before of the Father.

selves)—how could He speak any other than the pure truth of God?[1]

Ver. 31. Teschendorff here interjects the interruption of a contradicting—"Thou bearest witness of Thyself!" (of what value is that?) and there is nothing inappropriate in the supposition. It is possible, though not probable, that the testimony which the Evangelist gives as one was occasionally interrupted, and thus broken up into parts; it is not probable, for the Evangelist elsewhere is accustomed to insert the interrupting rejoinders. It is too universallly recognised that within the circle of fallible and selfish humanity a man's own testimony in his own affairs is of no avail, to render any resort to the Talmud or other learned source necessary. But Tholuck quotes the Rabbinical אֵין אָדָם נֶאֱמָן עַל פִּי עַצְמוֹ—Lücke, with others, Pomponius de testibus—nullus idoneus testis in re sua intelligitur, in connection with which the notes to a certain song involuntarily occur to my mind.[2] Such an allegation against His testimony the Lord might have answered in two ways:—by vindicating His true and holy self in distinction from self as applied to us (as ch. viii. 14); or, as here, by speaking more accommodatingly, and in the spirit of the allegation—"*If I, in the sense in which ye understand it,* testified of Myself, then would My testimony be indeed unworthy of credit. But such a solum Ἐγώ is, as I have said, in My case *impossible.*" This is the immediate result of taking vers. 19 and 30 together, as those who heard must have felt.

Ver. 32. But *another!* It is a melancholy exhibition of the superficiality of much of the exposition both of ancient and modern times, that this most sublime Ἄλλος, in which the Lord distinguishes Himself from the Father without prejudice to their essential Oneness, just as in chap. xiv. 16 He distinguishes the Holy Ghost, has been so generally misapprehended. Assuredly the discourse does not in this disjointed way introduce something quite new, the explanation of which we should have to seek in the sequel, but it keeps still its relation to what had

[1] Wimmer also, in the Stud. und Krit. 1845. i. 118, thus rightly understands the passage.

[2] Wandsbecker Bote, third part, at the beginning.

been said before, with a design to confirm it; and from what had preceded it must necessarily follow that this ἄλλος must be the ἐκεῖνος of ver. 19, now set in opposition to the hypothetical false Ἐγώ. Another in the distinction of persons, and yet not another as He who ever worketh and testifieth in the Son Himself; just as the υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου is ever one with the eternal Son of God. How could the Son, indeed, after all that He had testified and declared concerning Himself, receive witness from another, from an actual *man*, ver. 34? As it regards the formula ἄλλος ἐστίν we may compare those strictly similar in chap. viii. 50, 54, and so also ver. 18 of the same chapter. The present in ὁ μαρτυρῶν and μαρτυρεῖ of itself forbids us to interpret it of the Baptist, who is introduced in ver. 35 with ἦν.[1] In the καὶ οἶδα appears again once more the self-consciousness of Him who alone had heard and seen the Father, the stamp of which in word and work of itself exhibits this testimony of the Father περὶ αὐτοῦ as also a testimony δι' αὐτοῦ. He who is repelled by the supposition that καὶ οἶδα, ὅτι ἀληθής ἐστιν ἡ μαρτυρία αὐτοῦ are the words of the Son in relation to the Father, should compare chap. iii. 33, vii. 28, viii. 26, 55, before he decides to reject it. God is the true God emphatically, the Son, in whom He is, liveth, and beareth witness, knoweth Him to be such immediately—and in a manner quite different from man's knowledge that God cannot lie.

Ver. 33. The Jews as νωθροὶ ταῖς ἀκοαῖς might indeed, as they would understand the ἐγώ of an individual man like themselves, so also pervert this ἄλλος into another man in the ordinary sense, and consequently, as he was most likely to occur to their minds, understand it of John the Baptist. The Lord had foreseen this, and He would by it awaken their *conscience*, for the testimony of John was also a true testimony of the Father; afterwards making that lead the way to a higher and more immediate testimony. So that Teschendorff's interpolation is once more not amiss—"Ah, thou meanest John the Baptist, who, they say, testified concerning Thee!" The Lord hereupon

[1] It is well known, however, that Chrys. Theophyl. Euthym. Nonnus (who has ἄλλος ἀνήρ), Erasmus, etc., understand it of the Baptist: Grotius called it facillimum (!)—while men like Hess echo it, and de Wette and Baumgarten-Crusius maintain it vigorously.

answers not simply—I mean not *him*; but—"Not him as a man, and not him alone!" For we must now assert, what almost all expositors fail to discern, that *all* which follows is no more than a development of the previous declaration—ἡ μαρτυρία, ἣν ὁ πατὴρ μαρτυρεῖ περὶ ἐμοῦ; that is, that the Lord now points out the three testimonies, the *Baptist's*, that of the *works*, and that of *Scripture*, as one consistent and concerted testimony of God. Here there is a most significantly developed gradation. When the Father would *send forth* His Son, He gave His testimony by the Forerunner whom He sent; whose finger, pointed to Jesus, concentrated in itself, and finally closed, the entire Old Testament reference to Christ as contained in the preaching of repentance in the law, and in the announcement of the kingdom in the prophets. But this testimony appealed for its own value to the mighty demonstration of the Fulfiller who came after him who gave it. Now testifies *in the middle place* the Father *Himself* (ver. 37); that is, He testifies most directly by the works of the Son, who for us utters His voice and reveals His shape, as it never else was seen or heard; thus the word of John is essentially confirmed by Christ, and the word of the last Prophet, as well as of all who preceded him, becomes a βεβαιότερος λόγος for our ἔχομεν, through the coming of Him whose coming was foretold. (2 Pet. i. 19.) And then, finally, the entire Old Testament *Scriptures* (to which the new and apostolical were added to this end) become illustrated in this light, and glorified into the *third* and *last* testimony, to which alone, even after the manifestation and works of the Son, unbelief can be *referred* through all the ages of time. Not as if it could be in itself a *greater witness* besides and above the Son Himself; but for *our* conviction—and thus according to the essential idea of the word—the originally given and abiding *testimony* of the ancient Scriptures is actually the *greatest*. For, it is only in the right understanding of them, in the comparison of Him who stands before us quickening and judging us and the world, with Him ὃν ἔγραψε Μωϋσῆς καὶ οἱ προφῆται (ch. i. 46), that the works of the Son become understood and appreciated, so that our εὑρήκαμεν may follow.[1] Such

[1] So that this is the reason why Schleiermacher, rejecting the Old Testament, can never find anywhere the true Christ.

is the progression of the three witnesses, according to which vers. 33 and 38 appear to be no other than a reproving reference and appeal—"*Ye* sent unto John, and yet believed him not;—*Ye* see and hear Me, and in Me the Father, but ye believe not; but then in ver. 39 arises the exhortation and *direction*—Now search into the *Scriptures* better than you have hitherto done, and with this one declaration alone can I dismiss you!" Thus much preparatorily upon the wide-spread controversy between the Indicative and the Imperative in this passage.

In this second part the reproving ὑμεῖς, taken from the λέγω ὑμῖν, is placed in sharply defined antithesis with the ἐγώ, for the judicial detection of their unbelief. "Ye manifested, and indeed possessed, when John came, the beginning of faith; and acknowledgment of the solemn truth of his plain words—though he wrought no miracle[1]—was extorted from you." We know with what convincing power our Lord elsewhere laid this fact upon their consciences—see our exposition of Matt. xii. Vol. ii. "Even ye Pharisees desired to hear him, as did Herod when he was in prison; ye *sent* unto him with a certain measure of confidence in him, to *ask* that man if he was himself the Messiah. But when his answer came which pointed to Me, it was not according to your mind, because ye *would* not come to Me; and then was the unbelief of your hearts made manifest. He bare witness to the *truth* (Grotius: modeste dictum, non *mihi*), that is, he confessed and denied not (chap. i. 20), he humbly declared what was the truth, that he was not the Messiah, and pointed to Me, coming after him." Thus the Lord, on the other side, confirms and approves the word of His minister and forerunner, responding with ἐγώ εἰμι to his οὗτος ἐστι. The Lord is not here reminding the members of that mission to John of any single testimony, personally pointing out Jesus, which they had suppressed because of the people (as Lange thinks); it is not of any other record not preserved that He here speaks, but of *that* testimony which we read in St John, and which they had indeed

[1] "God did not give John miracles to work, in order that no man might say—John wrought miracles as well as He! How can we decide? The Jews would have had more difficulty in distinguishing between Christ and John—it would ever have been a cause of confusion to them." Berlenb. Bibel.

suppressed before Himself and the people alike, by not believing it.

Ver. 34. The correct reading is undoubtedly ἀνθρώπου, and this singular of itself points to the true sense in which we can understand our Saviour to repel the ordained testimony of him who witnessed of Christ *that all men through Him might believe*, chap. i. 7. Now, although on the one hand, it is not John who can previously approve Jesus as a higher authority, but John himself, who is first approved by all things that he spake of this man being found to be true (chap. x. 41)—yet, on the other hand, he was sent of God as the greatest prophet, and consequently his witness was as certainly the voice and word of God from heaven, as the voices at the Jordan and Mount Tabor. Our Lord's meaning must be interpreted as an accommodation to their unbelieving want of understanding. As they held Himself to be a mere man, so they denied the man of God in John; and, in the pure Rationalist style, might suppose that their mutual appeals were the result of a concerted and secret plan. It is against this that the word so keenly protests—"*I*, the Son of God, *receive not* the testimony (with the article—*the* testimony, necessary to me as in ver. 31 I admitted to you) from John *as from a man*;"[1] for, and now we quote Zeller, "where is the *ambassador* of Cæsar or King, who, instead of seeking his authentication directly from his own sovereign himself, would appeal to the testimony of the *secretary to his embassy?*" "If it *were* merely human testimony—though ye think so—I would either not mention it at all, or absolutely reject it; but I do mention it, and I do refer to it, consequently ye perceive that I appeal to it as the testimony of *God*, who also hath sent this man." Τὴν μαρτυρίαν does not go back generally to ver. 31, as we have already said (Bruckner—*which I needed*)—but hangs directly upon ver. 32, and includes, as we pointed out, the words of the Baptist also under the testimony of *the Father*. The Lord begins anew to teach here that which *Israel* should long ago have known, and which the appeal

[1] Λαμβάνειν is, indeed, here not merely—to allow the validity, to accept (as ch. iii. 11, 32), but to appropriate, seek out, allege, urge as evidence; standing parallel with ζητεῖν in ver. 44. But the expression "*grasp at*" is too strong, for here as in ver. 41 we can only assign with propriety the softer meaning to our Lord.

afterwards to Scripture as the final testimony emphatically decides—that Divine testimonies are given through men. And as He now saith this *that they might be saved*, so also hath God the Father from age to age for our salvation's sake condescendingly given His word to man by the instrumentality of man. First at the conclusion, ver. 36, do we perceive prominence given to *τὴν μαρτυρίαν*; thus expressing the contrast between the testimony immediately given by the Father and that given mediately through John the Baptist.

Ver. 35. The *ἦν*[1] indicates that John's course was now fulfilled, that he was in prison, if not actually put to death. But the article which must not be pretermitted in *ὁ λύχνος* has a large signification as an attestation for John; more particularly in this twofold sense. It places him in opposition to the true *φῶς* as a human instrument, a light being kindled in him for his own age; but it also points him out as *the* expected Forerunner, who was to come, the Elias before the Messiah. And with this coincides the expression used concerning him, and which is almost literally that of Ecclus. xlviii. 1 concerning Elias: —*ἀνέστη προφήτης ὡς πῦρ, καὶ ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ ὡς λαμπὰς ἐκαίετο.* Now, whether the Lord consciously and designedly referred to the words of Sirach's son (and we have most undeniable proofs of such *allusions* to apocryphal passages in His discourses), or whether this was a current proverb concerning Elias in those days, does not affect the question at all: the thing remains the same, the reference is perfectly plain and obvious. We must, however, inquire into the meaning of *καιόμενος καὶ φαίνων*, which are certainly not tautological. The *καίεσθαι* is obviously, as in Ecclus., intended of that fiery *zeal* which was the essential spirit of Elias (Lu. i. 17, ix. 55); and that in a twofold contrast:—first, with the peaceful and mild beaming of light and truth in Christ; and then with the childish folly—afterwards alluded to—which desired only to take pleasure in the light, without being consumed by the zeal. But the Lord indicates a yet deeper meaning by the collocation of the two words:—that *man* generally, even a prophet (as the Apostles Lu. xii. 35), can

[1] Bengel, who assigns a later date to the embassy, strives to show that the *ἦν* places the Baptist in the past, because the Jews were weary of him, and he himself already obscured by the greater light of Jesus.

only give light by burning, like a lighted candle—until he is burnt out, and his mission upon earth ceases. Thus did the Baptist burn—brightly, but rapidly—he was upon the scene only πρὸς ὥραν. God had placed him, as St Augustine says, upon the candlestick, "that men might, by his candle, seek the day"—but even this accommodation to their infirmity was in vain, and was the occasion of a fearful perversion. A man like this preacher of repentance was not sent to be rejoiced in, but for the awakening of λύπη κατὰ θεόν; they, however, played with him as children play with the light that comes into the room; they know not yet the use of the light, and only take pleasure in its lustre, without using it to light them to duty and earnest employment. Although this implies an acknowledgment enforced from them that in him there was φῶς, the truth, yet it was no more to them (as Luther's translation aptly expresses it) than a mere *schein* or brightness, which led them to stream into the desert without any spirit of obedience to the truth, without any actual repentance or faith, and stand or sit before him like their fathers before Ezekiel, see Ezek. xxxiii. 30–33. The first ὑμεῖς had made prominent the actual representatives and rulers of Israel; but the second one includes more especially the mass of the common people; and this word is at the same time a proof (in opposition to Lange's above-mentioned remark) that the Lord was speaking publicly here, and not before any tribunal. He could not thus have spoken before the greater or lesser Sanhedrim; but if He was comprehending together both rulers and people, He might impute to each party, as in vers. 33 and 35, what the other had done. Just as in Matt. xvii. 12 He imputes by ὅσα ἠθέλησαν even Herod's act to the entire people, see Vol. ii. The ἠθελήσατε is the language of sharp reproof and irony, and discloses preparatorily the secret principle of evil in their will, as it fully comes out in the οὐ θέλετε of ver. 40. Whatsoever *they* either will or will not, is alike contrary to the testimonies of God! The light shineth upon them in vain, and no fire from heaven can set them on fire! Lange and Bengel (and Cyril and Chrysostom of old) refer the πρὸς ὥραν to the people's will (ne voluntas quidem vestra fuit diuturna), but we hesitate to accept this: for we do not read that the people had abandoned John the Baptist before his retirement, nor is it

probable; and the capriciousness of individual runners to and fro,—of whom there were many, doubtless, who only paid heed to him πρὸς ὥραν,—still less suits a discourse so general as this. We think the thought more striking, the declaration more convincing, if we take it thus:—As long as this light burned and shone, ye were there to look at it—but now that he is gone, where is the fruit of repentance towards God, and of faith towards Me? If we ask, finally, what was the ἀγαλλιασθῆναι in John which the Lord allows the people to have felt, the answer is obvious—They rejoiced to hear that the kingdom of heaven was at hand and the Messiah come; everything else they passed over, and painted the Messiah to their own imaginations as they would desire to have Him.

Ver. 36. We have already shown in what sense μείζω is to be understood, and have now only to remark that it gives us to see the principle of the order of these three testimonies; and hence that the testimony of the Scriptures must be relatively the *greatest*. For we can think of no other than a mere relative sense *for us*, when we narrowly examine the subject. Just as the works of the Son are in their foundation all alike great as the works of God, the first faint commencement of judging and quickening in the human heart being a power of God equally with the last things of the last great day, while yet for our θαυμάζειν they are developed as ever increasing μείζονα, greater and greater things are spoken of;—so, while all true testimonies of God are equally great in themselves, they penetrate our unbelief with a gradation of energy—at first more and more direct and immediate, the strongest evidence is finally reached by falling back upon the written medium again. Christ as the Sun needed no longer the light of John, and then finally the prophetic-apostolic word (once more to cite 2 Pet. i. 19) shone with the brightest lustre of all, upon the dark places of unbelief. Τοῦ Ἰωάννου instead of τῆς μαρτυρίας τοῦ Ἰωάννου (Vulg. Johanne—Erasm. testimonio Johannis) is a breviloquence which, though the philologist Winer counts it of no significance, has in it here something emphatic; for not merely is the Lord's ἐγώ, but the Father Himself, thereby put in clear antithesis with the ἄνθρωπος,—although *this man*, so to speak, was himself absolutely nothing but a witness and a testimony.

We have made it already sufficiently plain to our readers that the *works* to which the Lord here appeals, cannot possibly[1] be merely signs and wonders in the narrow sense. The offence which the older orthodoxy has given to Rationalism through laying too great stress upon the evidence of miracles, must be cancelled by a deeper insight. Let the first part of this discourse be rightly understood, which, treating of the ἔργοις, regards them only as the exciting, teaching symbols of His inward operation: even the μέγιστα and ἔσχατα at the last day being only the final external manifestation of an internal resurrection and of an internal condemnation. Let it be observed that in ver. 24 He most distinctively points to the evidence of the experience of the inner man, and in ver. 30 only appeals to the holiness of His own life. Let the words spoken at the close of the Lord's public life, John xii. 37, be well understood in their analogy with Ps. xcv. 9; and it will be seen that the wonders displayed before the eyes avail not unless the ears of the dead hear the voice of the great awakening call. We do not indeed by this disparage the miracles: they stand among His works, as in the Lord's meaning here, so also in such passages as Matt. xi. 5, 21, 23. Acts ii. 22 gives them their full importance; but when the Lord speaks in St John of His works, as here and chap. x. 36–38, xiv. 10–12, He regards the miracles only in their connection with His entire holy life and His whole faithful testimony (so Lampe—totus operum ejus nexus), independently of which connection the greatest portenta both in Scripture and the nature of the case are regarded as valueless. "In Christ, whose entire operation, in teaching and acting, consisted in the constant exhibitions of an immanent, ever-present Divinity, all activity is coincident with miracle: hence St John says simply ἔργα." (Beck, Einleitung. S. 189.) With this view alone will ἵνα τελειώσω αὐτὰ harmonize, spoken with the same fulness of meaning as in chap. iv. 34 and xvii. 4.[2] All His ἔργα are one great ἔργον, which proceeds onwards towards its consummation before our eyes in individual ἔργοις. The Father hath given

[1] Although Olshausen and Storr, Flatt and Kuinoel, believe this!

[2] For the explanation of this in the Schullehrerbibel of Brandt is very flat—that I should do all that is appointed to me, even on the Sabbath, whether ye will or not!

them to Him that He may do them, but at the same time it is the Father who doeth them in Him (chap. xiv. 10), and *thus hath* the Father, since His coming and work, ever borne witness to Him; there is no other more immediate self, no other exhibition of the Father than in the Son and His works—that is, His whole life and act, including His *word*, and in the peculiar light of that His own word, brightly shining and clearly speaking to all. This is our anticipatory exposition of the following verse.

Vers. 37, 38. There are not wanting, indeed, expositors (they may be seen in Lampe) who interpolate here a *fourth* testimony, to which the μεμαρτύρηκε referred—namely, the voice from heaven which bare witness to the Son at His baptism in the Jordan. We can only say that, on the one hand, this testimony, as pertaining only to the Son Himself, could not be appropriately numbered among the testimonies for others who should, through it, believe; and, further, as it only became known through the words of the Baptist,[1] it is already included in the first of our three testimonies. We cannot by any means understand how the Lord could lay the stronger emphasis upon a transaction so mysterious as that which was seen and heard only by John and Himself,—after He had been appealing to the wonderful works which had been manifested to the world. And though in that testimony the voice of the Father was heard, yet was not *His shape* seen; consequently we cannot think that the Lord, in speaking here to these Jews, would incorporate in His words His own secret reflections upon that mysterious assurance which He had Himself received from the Father—as in chap. i. 51 we discerned such a secret reference in His words to the first disciples. It remains, that He is still speaking of the testimony of the works, that of the whole personal work of Jesus; but now, precisely as at ver. 35, the blindness and deafness of the unbelieving Jews as it respects this testimony is most significantly and impressively described.[2]

[1] Since now no one believes that it took place in frequenti populi confluxu.

[2] Zeller in the Monatsblatt arranges three witnesses, in another manner and apparently very ingenious, and with a typical application of the revelation at the baptism to the Father's drawing to the Son—

Lange, following many of the Fathers,[1] discovers here an antithesis between μεμαρτύρηκε and μαρτυρεῖ, as if between the Old Testament and the New, and consequently supposes that the reference to the entire Old Testament Scriptures ("the Father doth not now begin His testimony concerning Me!") begins already here in ver. 37; but in opposition to this we have only to remark that the μεμαρτύρηκε is strictly parallel with the ἔδωκε. Nor are we to regard it directly as meaning "the immediate Divine testimony in the inmost soul of believers," although the Lord presently afterwards goes on to lay bare the truth, that *without this* all other testimony would ever be ineffectual. He is most assuredly speaking here beforehand of an *objective* testimony of the Father, and His meaning is—As I have already done many works, and spoken many words, in these the most immediate testimony of the Father *hath been long with you*, but *ye* have not yet heard or seen anything of it! And *why?* This is the right point in which to find the transition to the preparatory testimony of the *Old Testament*—*Because* ye have not received and appropriated *that* in faith, ye remain deaf and blind to Me! This thought is fully confirmed by ver 47. But why does the Lord speak here thus of the *voice* and the *shape* of God? This expression is, first of all, based upon the revelations of God in olden time, in which He either *spake* to the prophets, or *appeared* to them—such must have been the immediate impression which it would make upon Jewish ears. Εἶδος αὐτοῦ ἑωράκατε we are not to regard as merely "beheld a sight of Him," but in the full meaning of Numb. xii. 8, מַרְאֶה and תְּמוּנַת יְהוָה (LXX. ἐν εἴδει, τὴν δόξαν κυρίου εἶδε), as essentially and properly as the *voice* from Sinai, in connection

(1) the testimony of His *works*, which the Father hath given to Him; (2) the testimony of the immediate voice of the Father, by which He calleth those who hear to His Son—Hear Him! and (3) the testimony of *Scripture*. But the testimony of the Baptist is here very improperly omitted: this was human and Divine, just as the prophetic Scripture is; and we may reasonably ask where the *shape* of the Father is in this interpretation, since it cannot of course be referred to the form of the dove.

[1] Cyril. Theophyl. Nonnus also makes prominent the prophetical Scripture:—φθεγγομένοις στομάτεσσι θεογλώσσων διὰ φωτῶν μαρτυρίην ζώουσαν ἀμοιβαίῃ πόρε δέλτῳ.

with which there was no form visible to the *people;* so that the two expressions taken together embrace the Law and the Prophets, as they were already united in the person of Moses. If we ask further, in what sense He could allege against the Jews that they had not heard and seen God like the Fathers, Moses and the Prophets, we are driven to a deeper interpretation by the *paradox* of these designedly mysterious words,—words which, like many others which our Lord uttered, were intended to arouse the conscience by baffling the understanding. First of all He would say to them :—"Ye are not such as the believing men who received the former revelations, they would not and could not have been vouchsafed to you;"[1] and then further :—"For, although ye have these voices and appearances of God *in the Scripture* as having been afforded also *for you*, yet *ye* have never *understood* them, never heard them or seen them aright!" For all external revelation of God avails nothing unless it is met by the susceptible hearing and seeing of man. If, finally, we meditate profoundly upon this marvellous word, we find another *undertone of meaning* in them. It is quite right to say that the Lord does not here deny, but rather affirm, the reality of the φωνή and of the εἶδος of God (else would the entire Old Testament be contradicted); yet we must remember further, that He is speaking properly of the voice and form of the πατὴρ αὐτός, and He finally does actually deny by the striking πώποτε that such ever did, or ever could exist for men, *independently of Himself.* Let ch. vi. 46 also be taken into the account—a parallel so exact that we must necessarily interpret our passage according to its analogy, as well as that of the Prologue (ch. i. 18). He who appeared, and He who spake in the Old Covenant, was never the Father Himself, but always the self-same eternal Son who at last appeared in the flesh.—This is an axiom firmly established for all orthodox exposition of Scripture. Thus the saying of our Lord is so ordered that He does not declare with an indefinite generality, "Ye know not God in any manner, have not seen Him or heard Him" (Klee), but—Ye have neither understood generally all the former voices

[1] By which did He incidentally *design* their fables about the בַּת קוֹל? See afterwards on ch. xii. 28.

and revelations which have been transmitted to you; nor do ye now know that in all of them the same Son was heard and seen who now standeth in your midst. *Else* would ye, and must ye know and understand Me, whose word and whose person is now the final φωνή of the Father, and His only possible εἶδος! The Father Himself speaketh with you, shows Himself to you in Me, as He never did before; but ye have ears, and hear not, eyes have ye, and see not! (Deut. xxix. 4).

Why, finally, is this, and wherein does it lie? The last clause gives the solution. The *word* of the Father (now comprising both, for even His form would only *speak* to us) ye have not dwelling *in you*, or rather *abiding;* it hath never laid hold upon you, and found firm lodgment in your hearts. (Χωρεῖν ἐν ὑμῖν, ch. viii. 37.) This λόγος αὐτοῦ, τοῦ πατρὸς is assuredly *not* an independently existing, *other*, *first* revelation in the conscience (against this meaning of λόγος in Olshausen, Lücke rightly protests); but it is that one *Word* of the Father, ever tending from above and from without to the inner being of man, ever seeking a place and lodgment in his heart, the profoundest and most essential reality of which can be actually no other than the eternal Λόγος of St John's prologue. But *that* is not now speculatively introduced by our Lord: He now rather refers by this λόγος to that which He afterwards more directly designates as τὰς γραφάς; here marking the transition to the third and last *testimony*, the externally at least *abiding* form. Ye *have* the word of God,—that is, not the Father's immediate word, but as mediated by Me from the beginning in every voice and manifestation—*in your books;* but ye have it only external, and are like the deaf and blind (Isa. xxix. 11, 12, 18); it has never laid hold upon your inmost souls. *For* ye show this, it is made manifest by this (an ὅτι for διὸ as ἀποδεικτικὸν as Lu. vii. 47), that ye believe not on Him, whom the Father hath now sent, speaking in Him more loudly, and appearing more plainly, than ever before.[1] Yea, ye do not even believe τουτῷ—in the dative—as a Prophet, who testifieth of

[1] Münchmeyer teaches me that grammatically ὅτι never could stand for διό. I know very well that formally it could not, but in its meaning it might; that is as διὸ ἀποδεικτικόν—which on that account I expressly inserted above.

God as His Father, and thus of Himself. Learn here, that in order to man's believing the testimony of Jesus, a preparation is previously required:—among the covenant people of God through the Scriptures, among the heathen (though they are left out of the question in this discourse to the Jews) through something analogous at least. But when this is wanting, and neither are the works of the Son *seen* nor His words *heard*, what remains but to *refer back* unbelief to the *Scriptures*, which are in their totality the *word* which fully corresponds to the revelation of God in the flesh?

Ver. 39. We read in Bengel—Brentius *magni* judicii interpretes esse ait, qui indicativum statuant; let me be permitted to add—*majoris* vero aio, qui tamen imperativum. For to take unexamined ancient tradition or ecclesiastical translation is no magnum judicium; but to find our way back to the right, in spite of a specious learned criticism, is something more than that criticism, it is a higher potentiality into which criticism must raise itself. The Peschito translates it in the imperative בצו; so did Chrys., Augus., Theophyl., Euthym., accept the word, and generally most of the ancients, with Calvin, Beza, and Wetstein; so also does Olshausen, with Paulus, and Baumgarten-Crusius. Lange also, to my satisfaction, seemed to lean that way—"hence He *exhorts* them, to go and study the ancient Scriptures more profoundly;" though, alas, in his third volume, p. 598, he returns to a contradictory decision for the indicative. I myself, in the first edition of Vol. ii., followed in this track, until I came to study the passage more closely in St John himself. It does not affect the matter at all that the formula since ἀπεστάλκατε runs between simple indicatives, nor that ὅτι δοκεῖτε and οὐ θέλετε follow these words—when the subject and its connection of thought demand something different. And we have already prepared the way for the conviction that the whole context, taken in its completeness, demands the change. If the testimony of the Scriptures is actually the last and greatest, and if *on that account* the Lord now first refers to them; if, as we have seen, the unbelief of the Jews towards Jesus was fundamentally based upon their misunderstanding of those Scriptures, what could be more proper than the change and progression of the discourse into an imperative? We cannot but expect from Him who now

speaks ἵνα σωθῶσι, that He would not dismiss them with nothing but reproaches, rather that He would send them away with exhortation and hope. It is to us as if He should say—Ye sent in vain to John, who sent you back to Me; I Myself stand before you, but ye know Me not; *I now therefore send you back and refer you* to your own Scriptures again! Did He not often do the same, requiring them to go and to read and learn how it was written? Would they not be constrained (as Hofmann, Schriftbeweis i. 568 affirms) now first to investigate the Scriptures as they never had before, in order to find Him of whom they testify—actually to possess in them that which they thought they possessed?[1]

Now let us go on to examine the word ἐρευνᾷν itself! Some one, whose name we have not noted, utters this warning:—Caveant sibi juvenes ab *emphasi*, quam multi, parum græce docti, in hoc verbo invenisse sibi visi sunt; and Deyling reckons this invenisse among the emphasibus *fictis*. Now we would not go with others to the opposite extreme (following Chrys. comp. Prov. ii. 4), and call it a "thoroughly mining" word; yet it is clear enough to all *græce doctis* that the expression refers to an investigation of the grounds and internal part of things, that it is opposed to the superficial, and that it must here consequently refer to the πνεῦμα and not to the γράμμα of the γραφαί. We ask—Could there be imputed to the unbelieving and blind Jews in any admissible sense of the term an ἐρευνᾷν τὰς γραφάς?[2] Tholuck after Cyril imposes a rebuking sense upon the word as if directed against their ἀκρίβεια in the mere letter, and Teschendorff follows in the same track—"Ye *grovel* in the Scriptures;" but this is contrary to the Greek usage,[3] and the latter is obliged, though involuntarily,

[1] See it excellently shown that through Christ alone the Old Testament becomes truly *Scripture*, in Petersen's v. d. Kirche i. 182.

[2] The Berlenb. Bibel says—"They were not so much investigators as rummagers and tearers of the Scripture." The true דרשׁ was wanting to their מִדְרָשִׁים; their חֹקְרִים were very far from the true חקר.

[3] All the places in the New Testament have the word in a good sense—see especially 1 Pet. i. 11; Rom. viii. 27; 1 Cor. ii. 10, and the ἐρεύνησον καὶ ἴδε of Jno. vii. 52. So also the Sept. for דרשׁ and חקר. In a bad sense it cannot be found in Greek literature.

to add his much too stringent imperative, when he continues—"*Seek* only with honest minds, for it is this which testifies of Me!" And so similarly Gossner shifts round:—"but if *we* would rightly apply this text in our day, we must turn it into a positive command; that which was said to the Jews as a *rebuke*, must become to us a *precept* of the Saviour!" We find in these words a most decisive and important principle, which we shall not shrink from making still more emphatic. If in thy practical exegesis for the church of God thou canst not avoid adopting, or admitting the value of, any traditional and also obvious interpretation of Scripture, be very confident that such and no other is the mind of the Spirit in the word. Does the Lord speak only in these words of St John to the Jews of that day, or is He not speaking to us, and to all ages? Is it not in the highest possible degree probable, to speak guardedly, that He Himself in the beginning, and afterwards the Holy Ghost in the Evangelists, had in His eye His future congregation? Now is it not a truth which approves its certainty always and to this day, that the Scripture remains the last testimony to which unbelief may be *referred*, even as it was that which manifestly contributed to the perfecting of the faith of the first disciples? Let it be observed that the *Risen One* in Lu. xxiv. excited their faith towards His resurrection by means of Moses and the Prophets, before He revealed Himself to the eyes of His disciples; and then, after He had revealed Himself to their eyes, opened their spiritual eyes fully to understand those Scriptures? Let it be remembered that very many Jews who heard and saw the living Lord in the flesh to no purpose were afterwards convinced by the Apostles' appeal to the ancient Scriptures! Thus let men learn to place these in their right place, even in that in which Christ here places them. Nor should we hesitate to go further and say, that although He at first, and for His then present hearers, could have intended only the Old Testament, He, with prophetic prevision, included for His future church the New Testament writings afterwards to be written, in which alone His voice should ever be heard, and His form ever be seen. It is probable that He united in His meaning that דִּרְשׁוּ מֵעַל סֵפֶר יְהוָה of Isa. xxxiv. 16 (quite missed by the Sept.) with Ps. xl. 8; but most assuredly He utters here a word for

all futurity; the loud *imperative* meaning will never cease to hold good in its exhortation—Seek and investigate, not merely in your hearts, in your understanding, but in the abiding written word of God! Without this word there is no intelligent faith, no blessing in the worship of God, no power in the sacraments, no Holy Spirit in the church! Without *Scripture* there is no church and no people of God![1] The way to Me, the first coming as well as the constant and progressive communion with Me, is only through these Scriptures, this originally given *Word!* This is the fundamental principle of the great reformation which now seeks to point the souls of men to Christ Himself.

But here we must necessarily remember the warning which these words enforce, by the example of the blinded Jews, against a false, self-willed, unbelieving, and proud dealing with the mere letter; and the frightful delusion that without the true ἐρευνᾶν into its spiritual contents, in their mere dead letter,—*to have life!*[2] Look, what the Jews have now left them in their synagogues—the chests with the Thorah instead of the living Christ for whom Moses would have prepared their minds, and all their Talmudical mystical folly! Not to mention the fearful analogy of the tabernacle in the Romanist Mass!

Hamann says very properly: "The Jewish *opinion*, that they had in their Scriptures eternal life, was probably as *prejudicial* as it was favourable to their duty of examining them; and this (the examination) is assuredly to be *recommended* to all ignorant or thoughtless Theists" (iv. 260). But we must add to this, that most assuredly the Jewish supposition, which led to a high estimate of the Scriptures, is greatly to be preferred to that contempt of the written word which has utterly lost the one and only way marked out for inquiry. Israel, possessing still the Old Testa-

[1] That is, taking all history into the account. For though in the beginning (according to the well-known saying of Irenæus) barbarians without paper and ink had the doctrine of the Spirit written upon their hearts—yet this did not obviate the necessity of sending even to them the Holy Scriptures. And as little does the dogma of a Scripture-interpreting Church follow from it (Möhler's Symbolik § 38).

[2] Certainly so when it is said with the Jewish proverb: "He who acquires the *words* of the *law*, obtains the life of the future world!" In strict opposition to this, our Lord places *Himself* as the living Redeemer.

ment, will enter into the kingdom, when the despisers of Scripture in the final unbelief of Christendom will be judged and condemned. It is sufficiently clear that this δοκεῖν of the Jews, that they already *had* in the possession of the Scriptures and in their manner of studying them, eternal life, is rejected and condemned by the Lord as a presumptuous delusion against all knowledge and conscience; but He Himself extracts the deep truth upon which that error was grafted, and clearly exhibits it, when He connects the denouncing clause by ὅτι with His own ἐρευνᾶτε, and then gives His own correction by the conceding καί. For it thus reads:—*Although* ye most improperly *think* that ye have already in the Scriptures life, yet I assure you that they *testify* most certainly of Me! Καί—*and that* is the undiscerned truth in their imagining—the Scriptures will lead to the Messiah, and *I am He!*[1] Let us carefully observe the unconditional warrant and confirmation which the τὰς γραφάς gives to the existing Jewish Canon. And further let us note the emphatic ἐκεῖναί εἰσιν αἱ μαρτυροῦσαι which recognises the contribution of every individual γραφή to the great Whole—it is not merely μαρτυροῦσι. "From the first book of Moses down to the last chapter of Malachi, the whole, yea almost every page, is full of testimonies concerning that mysterious person, who is there the Word of Jehovah, the speaking and appearing Jehovah, who as the Word of Jehovah speaks, and as the face of Jehovah appears, and who in the fulness of time exhibits Himself as God manifest in the flesh, the same of whom the Apostle writes—*The life* was manifested!" Thus expresses Zeller the inmost heart of our Lord's word; for although the "testifying of Him" embraces also all the more mediate allusions and references to the future Fulfiller, yet the sublime expression περὶ ἐμοῦ! when taken in connection with ver. 37, cannot mean less than, *I*, the

[1] Thus the ὅτι, which is so distinctively set against the imperative, does *not* belong to the first clause so much as to the second, or rather to all together. Here is the simple solution—in the right understanding of the whole passage—of that *two-sided* position of the Evangelist with regard to the Old Testament, to which Hilgenfeld (Ev. Joh. S. 213) refers when he says that their notion of the old Scriptures was in one sense false, inasmuch as they contained not life; in another true, inasmuch as they contained testimonies to the Λόγος. Compare also Luthardt's remarks against Schweizer. (Ev. John i. S. 6.)

Son—no God or Father being besides Me and without Me—am the God of whom the Scriptures testify. The testimony of Scripture is also a self-testimony of Christ, the Witness in all witnesses.

Ver. 40. But from the beginning ye would not come to the living and true God, hence ye have not hitherto found either the Father or Me in the Scriptures, and your reading and learning have not been a true investigation of their kernel, but a mere traffic with the shell; hence ye want no such Mediator and Redeemer as He to whom the whole Scriptures direct you, therefore it is that ye perceive not the gathering together of all the single rays of the past into the brightness of My glory, the consentient reference of all former lights to the full Light and Life which are now come, the concert and consummation of all past words of God in the words of My mouth. I should have been to you the gladly accepted realisation of a long and fervent waiting, and—*I am against you!* And although I now utter a mighty and still awakening testimony, and cry in your hearing and in your hearts—Ye *will* not come to Me, because and even as ye would not come from the beginning to the God and Lord to whom the Scriptures in their spiritual ground always bore testimony. Ye would have *life*, ye imagine to yourselves that ye have it, but ye turn away with abhorrence from the thought of coming *to Me* in order to receive it in truth, notwithstanding all My appeals to the weary and heavy laden, notwithstanding My loud cries to the dead; and your hearts have only responded to the Yea and Amen of all the combined testimonies of God by a fearful and a horrible *No!* These are indeed words of sharp condemnation as issuing from the lips which otherwise poured forth so much mercy: let us not, however, merely mourn over the entirely unbelieving to whom they entirely apply, but receive also their application to ourselves, as much or as little as they concern our unbelief-infected faith in the Scriptures and in Christ! How often do some of us read ourselves into the Scriptures and read ourselves out of them again; how easily are we unconsciously led to seek in them for something other than Christ, thinking it Christ all the while, supposing that we are daily and hourly coming to Him! We *think* indeed that we have come to Him and that we possess *Him*—but where is,

and how exhibits itself, the *life* which in that case we should have?—Many of my readers must pardon me, for the sake of many others, that I sometimes find it impossible to expound without preaching.

Vers. 41, 42. Third part of the whole. After the continuous promising and threatening *assertion*, vers. 19–29, came the *reproving* appeal to the Father's testimony concerning His Son, in whom they believed not; now finally follows a *warning* based upon the principle and results of *unbelief*, a real warning to others, —and even to these unbelievers themselves as far as they might be awakened—though couched in the form of most rigorous reproof. There stands it before us in all its shame—Unbelief in the mighty Son of God and merciful Son of man, unbelief in the *truth* of God as uttered in all His words, in the *love* of God as exhibited in every gesture and every voice! *Ye will not* come to Me! Thus mourns His love rebuking with truth which penetrated the secret principle of their unbelief; love hoping yet to win some of them to Himself, until the time comes when there will only remain the *lamentation—But ye would not!*

But that secret principle is not yet sufficiently detected. Once more and again a Wherefore! Wherefore *would* they not then come *to Him?* Because His selfless holiness contradicts their inmost nature, and forces upon their consciences a judgment to which they refuse to subject themselves. It was the humility of Jesus, in which the Father alone is seen to work and His testimony alone allowed to be heard, which repels their secret minds estranged utterly from the love of God. His humility begins the third time like vers. 19 and 30, but it now brings out what was said in ver. 34 as a summary of all the previous appeal to testimony—*I receive not honour from men!* Δόξα instead of μαρτυρία, however, advances a step further, in order to set over against it the κενοδοξία of This man. That which they find wanting in the Messiah, despite all the glory of the only-begotten shining from His person, was the "glorious manifestation" which would command the acknowledgment of men—that external exhibition of majesty which alone *they* could regard and appreciate as *honour* and glory. But they wilfully refuse to perceive that this contempt of *such* honour was not only precisely in harmony with His Divine dignity, but also

essential to His human holiness; so that this humility itself, through which He assigns to the Father all witness and all honour, becomes the summary evidence and testimony of His own true honour and dignity. Where is there a sinful man, who otherwise than through the grace of Christ, can utter these words after Him, without being belied by his conscience or his conduct?

This declaration is so obviously connected with the preceding, that we may regard it as an additional assurance of what had been already said:—the testimony of the whole Scripture which gives Him His honour and cries "This is He! *Go ye to Him!*" even as John's voice and finger-sign had done, is not a human testimony. Whosoever had in any age testified of Him and pointed to Him, the least as well as the greatest of the prophets, must have previously received His own testimony and His Father's through Him, that so it might be truly a Divine testimony. Quite different is that acknowledgment, complacency, and fame which come from *men* as natural and sinful men; that honour of the world which sinners only give to sinners, the proud to those who are still prouder than themselves. It is of this that He speaks, who sees through it all, and that with great gentleness instead of rejecting it with abhorrence:—*οὐ λαμβάνω*, such is not for Me, I may not, I cannot receive that! *This* *λαμβάνειν* is generally understood in a stronger sense (just like that of ver. 44), as if it signified an eager desire and seeking after it which our Lord repudiated; but it were below the dignity of the Lord simply to deny that; and the word has here, as in ver. 34, with reference *to Him* a softer sense, and the meaning is—I cannot receive it, even if it were given Me, which, however, as long as I deny not Myself, is impossible. Yea, they would at one time have clamoured Him their King; but as soon as He began to rule over them in truth and in righteousness, the cross and the crown of thorns were prepared for Him instead, because their desire and His are perfectly opposite. This Satan knew not, when he offered to Him all the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them: but He then at the very outset rejected them all. But, once more, *this* *δόξα παρὰ ἀνθρώπων* is something very different from that *τιμᾷν* which in ver. 23 He demands from all men, and which He finally must receive; *this latter* He desires for the

honour of the Father, and for Himself in the Father's name (ver. 43), as well as for our salvation, ver. 34.

He who avows such a disposition in Himself, on that very account hath long known and penetrated the hearts of these sinners, among whom He now stood. That *they* sought and received empty honour from men, from one another, He had already asserted in the former clause, the emphasis of which was —I not *like you!* Thence He goes deeper at once into their principles, and shows them their utter lack of that which, and not the honour of men, should be man's highest good and most desired honour. *The love of God*—which now takes the place of *life*, ver. 40; not *immediately* love towards God, but (according to the deep meaning of this word in the Scripture, in St Paul as well as in St John) the love of God flowing towards us, to which our love responds in return. It was not said in ver. 20—the Son loveth the Father; but as in the Son the love of the Father dwelleth and liveth, so it dwelleth and liveth *not* in these men estranged from God, and by persistent unbelief established in their enmity against God. Because they, according to ver. 37, had never seen and known God aright, they know and they possess nothing of His love; that is the reason why they seek not in return of love His honour alone, ver. 44.[1]

Vers. 43, 44. And now comes the *conviction*, showing them how this fundamental evil in their hearts exhibits itself in the rejection of Him, who is Himself the revealed Love of God! Jesus coming in the name of the Father is disowned and rejected; another, like themselves, is received, though to their own condemnation. Proceeding from this, and with emphatic comprehensiveness, the principle and reason of their conduct is further pointed to—How *can* ye otherwise? How can *ye*—receive *Me?* This conclusion flows so simply from

[1] We may, indeed, in a certain sense say that—if any one *had* (which, however, can never be true *absolutely* of *any* natural man) the love of God *in himself*, there would be no necessity of any external testimony—because generally no necessity of any σώζεσθαι through the σωτὴρ τοῦ κόσμου. Nevertheless Bengel is not right in saying, that is the causa, cur debeant remitti *ad homines*—for by that he misapprehends the testimony of Scripture as if a *human* testimony, which indeed it is not, even in a relative sense.

all which had gone before that no explanation is needed, only its enforcement upon the conscience. In the ἐλήλυθα the Lord once more proclaims Himself with the most customary and easily intelligible expression as the ἐρχόμενος (ch. iii. 2) promised throughout all the Scriptures; after whom, if they receive Him not, no other can come. (Matt. xi. 3.) If He does nevertheless speak of *another*, He must of course mean a false Messiah and Saviour, a deceiver and destroyer. But the Lord does not seem to speak hypothetically—"There might indeed come one instead of Me, whom ye would receive, as according to your mind;" but the λήψεσθε passes over into actual prediction. But this prediction was not fully and essentially accomplished in the false prophets, who were only the prelude, for they did indeed prophesy in the name of the Lord the deceit of their own heart (Jer. xiv. 14); nor in the subsequent sixty-four false Messiahs (whom Schuldt enumerates), for even these came in the name of Christ (Matt. xxiv. 5), not openly in *their own name*, and borrowed from truth the mask of their wickedness. The other in the singular, of whom the Lord here prophesies with reference to the entire wicked world adumbrated in wicked Israel, is finally *antichrist* with his open and avowed denial of God and of Christ, with his most daring I, before which all the proud will humbly bow down, because they will find themselves again in him, and honour him as their true God. As the Father reveals Himself in Christ, so will Satan manifest himself in *him* (who is the father of these Jews, ch. viii. 38), and give him all his work and witness, his own honour as the prince of this world; and the wicked will yield themselves to him, because through unbelief they have already fallen into his nature, and fitly belong to him. Thus *this* ἄλλος is the sharp antithesis of that one in ver. 32. Thus will the world finally judge and condemn itself, before it is utterly judged and condemned by God. (2 Thess. ii. 9, 10.)

And what is that preparatory principle in their hearts which ever more and more uninterruptedly will work onwards to that dire result? The Lord mentions it here once more, and it is the same with which the Evangelist closes the history of the first great stage of unbelief, ch. xii. 43. *Pride*, the root of all sin, Satanic pride which dares to oppose God, is the great

obstacle of *faith* in Christ; and makes that faith, as long as *it* is present and rules, *impossible*. Faith or unbelief is the alternative which decides the salvation of men, but these are rooted in a moral state of the heart (as the saying now is); and this our Lord testifies much in the same manner as at ch. iii. 19–21. Unbelief makes its objection and appeal down to our day, but that must not hinder us from stopping its mouth by throwing its guilt on its own head, from maintaining the testimony of pure truth which our Lord Himself hath here given us, and from answering the alleged—I *can* not believe! by—Alas no, but only because thou *wilt* not! Thus πῶς δύνασθε ὑμεῖς here follows close upon οὐ θέλετε. Men approve of all the propositions of those menders of the world who come in their own names,—but they elude and retire before the word of Him who is the only restorer of the human heart, and which also invites their test. They yield to the obligation which their lack of understanding entails, and follow the guidance of critics without end; but their hearts and consciences repel the κρίσις of the Son of God. Instead of honouring Him with the honour which is due to the merciful Father in Him from all the objects of His mercy, they seek *themselves* to be and to be called something; and pitiable as is the sin and the delusion, they *seek* and *receive* most willingly from others, whom in their cold, loveless, and self-seeking hearts they respect not at all, the expressions of supposed deserved honour! There is a deep irony in παρὰ ἀλλήλων, which should be profoundly studied in relation to the deception and the beggarliness of all honour among men:—a poor sinner receives praise from others, a liar rejoices to have his lie confirmed by another! A learned man (but not from God!) hears himself with great complacency cited by others as a famous and honourable doctor; although both parties hold the truth of the Socratic ignorance in unrighteousness, as their consciences well know! For even in this craving for human honour there lies a secret confession of poverty and of shame:—if thou knewest in truth thy own value, of what importance would be the voices and proclamations of men? But ye lust after[1] the vain appearance and the lie: how *can* ye give its honour to the truth of

[1] Λαμβάνειν has a stronger meaning than in ver. 34—captare.

God and *become* only *believers?*[1] As to the honour which cometh from *the only God*, the true God before whom every creature must bow,—ye have no mind, no will for that! For your I is your only God; and therefore, though you know it not, that *other*, the anti-God in his own name. Let us observe here the antithesis which is intimated between the μόνος θεὸς, to whom alone all honour belongs, and who returneth honour to His true worshippers, and Satan who seeks only himself to be honoured; and further, the express testimony given to the *oneness of the Father and the Son*, to obviate all misunderstanding, for it is not affected by the circumstance that the Son here uses ἄλλος and ἐκεῖνος concerning the Father; and finally, the distant exhibition of the true good as being the *honour of God*, which, despised of men, is afterwards, ch. xii. 26, most gloriously promised by the Lord as the portion of all His own.

Ver. 45. There remains to the unbelievers, who scorn this honour, the everlasting infamy of *condemnation*, the assured *consequence* of unbelief, proceeding from itself, since it wills nothing else; but the judgment is the utterance of *justice* over the despisers of *mercy*. Christ as the Son of man is not come to judge the world, but to save the world; He judgeth in mercy for the sake of conferring forgiveness, wherever His judgment may avail; He prayeth down to the last for all who, overcome by the persevering grace of His longsuffering, come to God through Him, that He may save their souls. His office and work is now and to the end that of *mediation and intercession;* when this is exhausted He will *judge*. Yet even then—for the future of this verse extends so far—it is not the Mediator of grace who will be an accuser. Satan bears this name elsewhere, as we know, but that *right* of Satan to his own for the fellowship of damnation which will finally be admitted even by God, rests upon the justice of God, whose expression is the *law* in opposition to the rejected grace. It is this which the Lord refers to here; He refers to it, however, not in the abstract, but by *Moses* its representative, because that was most appropriate on the present occasion, and because He would make pro-

[1] For the Inf. aor. πιστεῦσαι indicates this factum of a beginning faith, exhibiting itself by receiving testimony.

minent the fact that that same Moses was a witness of the Saviour and of salvation. By this means He would allow them no escape from the conviction that even their *accuser* had in vain pointed them to the source of *absolution;* and that nothing remained but accusation since they would not have it otherwise.

"The justification of Christ Himself has now passed into a discourse of condemnation directed against His judges. He whom they had brought before their tribunal, stands before them almost as an accuser." Lange has well expressed this reference of the closing words of Christ's protest; but there is something more in their meaning. He means, taking what had preceded into the account—"Think Me not an excited preacher of punishment; *imagine not that I am like yourselves*, that in your sense I seek My honour from you, and, *therefore*, complain of you because you have denied it to Me![1] I say unto you, on the contrary,—oh that ye would understand it—not even as the Son, *which I am*, having all requisite might and authority, do I complain of you *to the Father;* nor *will* I ever, as part of My office accuse you. Nor is there need of this—the gentleness of those words now turns to necessary severity—for your accuser is ready, he is the same Moses who speaketh to you before Me that which God had spoken to him for all sinners; Moses, whose faithful disciples ye proclaim yourselves to be, and whom ye oppose against Myself! chap. ix. 28, 29. The same Moses, in whom ye have placed your idle *hope*. The ἠλπικέναι is here obviously a rather external idea of false confidence without true πιστεύειν, as it is said immediately afterwards; just the same as the ἐπαναπαύεσθαι τῷ νόμῳ of Rom. ii. 17. Moses accuses them in a twofold manner;—in the name of the law which they do not keep (chap. vii. 19); and even if that accusation, which, indeed, goes out against all sinners, might be supposed to be nullified by atonement, it still remains in the case of these Jews, and with deeper severity, in that, secondly, they would not suffer themselves to be led by the same Moses unto Christ.

It is not right to say at once that Moses is here set for the

[1] As Dr Bauer and his fraternity slander the "Johannæan Christus."

Scriptures generally;[1] for, although in a wider development of meaning all that the Lord here says would hold good of the entire Scriptures already referred to, yet it is not without reason that *Moses*, at once the lawgiver and prophet, is made prominent; for the Lord's words require a personal accuser and testimony against them, and thus, in this last climax of His discourse, the contrast is most keenly and impressively exhibited between their perverted delusion and the truth which had been with them from the beginning, but which they had obstinately rejected. Compare the Song of Moses in Deut. xxxi., wherein he predicts the unbelief of the people; and which was to be placed along with the entire book of the law in the side of the ark of the covenant, *for a witness against them:* see vers. 21–26 of that chapter. And we find it, moreover, as the Talmudical formula in quoting his writings, מוֹכִיחֵנוּ מֹשֶׁה שֶׁכָּתוּב בּוֹ—Moses *blames*, condemns us, for it is thus written in him. (Debarim rabba sect. 1 fol. 248, col. 2.) Oh that they had indeed received his condemnation, and not perversely handled his words, refusing to receive their conviction into their consciences, but superstitiously founding upon their letter the hope of eternal life![2] The same may we say of the ethics deduced by human reason, which are but a confused and corrupted abstract of the law of God, even of the "morals" of a certain class in the present day which makes them their Moses in opposition to Christ;—they will accuse you, inasmuch as ye do not in thought and act so live as to stand even their test, for *then* would even these have led you to Christ.

Vers. 46, 47. Although this is a continuation of the concluding words, an explanation of the great paradox just uttered, yet does this *last word* also include one more reference to the profoundest reason of their unbelief (ver. 42), and to that most important testimony for faith, ver. 39. The weightiest circumstance in all the Scripture testimonies to Christ, the essential pædagogical principle in all the preparatory discipline for His

[1] So von Gerlach, in the introduction to this discourse of Jesus, S. 399.

[2] As the proverb before mentioned in Pirke Aboth runs—קוֹנֶה לוֹ דִּבְרֵי תוֹרָה קוֹנֶה לוֹ חַיֵּי עוֹלָם הַבָּא—and in Synopsis Zohar (cited in German by Döpke S. 27)—He who diligently *studies* the law in this life, will not come into judgment in the next.

coming, was this, that *the law* as such awakens the sense of need and the desire for grace; for without this influence of the law the *promise* which went before, accompanied, and followed the giving of the commandments, could not be embraced, as the Israelites sadly testified. Consequently the last reason of unbelief is—*the want of true and sincere subjection to the law!*

Ye believe not Moses—what a paradox for these Jews! And yet unanswerably true, true in a sense which disclosed their innermost guilt, as soon as they admitted the piercing words into their consciences. Their not believing in Christ is *the proof*, for true faith in Moses must necessarily be followed by faith also in Christ.[1] They *believed* him not in his account of the Creation and the Fall; for, had they received those great facts as truth, they would as sinful men have sought the living God, as Enoch and Noah had done. They believed him not in his narratives of the Patriarchs and their faith; else would they have walked in the steps of the faith of Abraham. They believed him not in the sacred, heart-piercing severity of the law, which he handed down; or they would never have gone about to establish their pharisaical self-righteousness. They believed him not, finally, in his economical dispensation, wherein the institution of priests and offerings was designed to bring their sins constantly to remembrance, and all the types and shadows of which pointed ever to a future fulfilment in the great reality; for, if they had, they would have been made already by *Moses*, what John the Baptist long afterwards endeavoured to make them, a people prepared for the Lord, and ready, like Simeon, to embrace His salvation with joy. And the same fulness and universality of meaning may be found, by a deep investigation, in the assertion which is brought forward again from ver. 39—Moses wrote of Me: Moses the First (Rom. x. 19), out of whose writings all the others were afterwards developed, upon which they were all built, and without which they could never be understood. Let our Old Testament Theologians remember this, and apply their ἐρευνᾶν (not that pseudocritical inquiry which deals only with the shell) first of

[1] Erasmus, Laur. Valla, Glassius have earnestly followed Priscian in maintaining, against the Vulg., that here and elsewhere (ch. viii. 19, Matt. xi. 23, etc.) ἄν is not *forsitan*.

all to the Pentateuch itself.[1] Moses wrote of Christ not only in the single predictions of the Seed of the woman, the blessing of Abraham, the Shiloh, the Prophet to come,—nor only when (as some one dreams) he gives the tokens of a prophet. But, as Bengel expresses it in his grand, laconic style—*nusquam non*, throughout and in everything which he wrote, in the same profound sense as that in which the *entire* extant Scripture testifies of Christ, leads and impels men's minds to Him. This is assuredly the Lord's ultimate meaning;[2] though for His first hearers His obvious meaning was,—The Lawgiver himself, that is, his *law*, if ye dealt earnestly with it, might and should have prophesied to you concerning Me, and have prepared your penitent hearts, hoping for God's love, to welcome Me.

Thus the "solemn and alarming note of interrogation" (to use Zeller's expression) with which our Lord concludes this discourse, is strictly analogous with that which was put to Nicodemus, ch. iii. 12:—Moses preaches the necessity, awakens the sense of need of *regeneration;* and how can he who has rejected that believe the testimony of the Saviour? But He appends something remarkable and peculiar to this by setting γράμματα and ῥήματα in opposition one to another—for even to the last there is a manifold variety of references and applications accumulating and pouring forth in His words. (And γράμματα for γραφαί yet further strengthens the contrast.) For although the living word uttered face to face is in itself more than any writing which may become a dead letter, yet it is in the nature of

[1] Moses did actually write it (if not with all its glosses and supplements); and Baumgarten-Crusius in vain attempts to invalidate this testimony of our Lord against all pseudo-criticism by the already refuted argument that Moses is put here for Scripture generally. Neander allows its full weight to the hypothesis of a "negative and formal accommodation," according to which our Lord "adopted the *ruling opinion* as to the authorship of these books," and yet says nothing to confirm it—but this is not in accordance with our theology generally, or our Christology in particular!

[2] Luthardt rightly: Not this or that individual word alone, but all the writings of Moses. And as Moses may be deemed the representative of the Old Testament, the Lord's word may be extended so far as to assert that Himself was the substantial contents of all Old Testament Scripture.

distrustful man rather to believe the original, firmly settled writings which have been handed down through ages; *therefore* it is generally that the Divine condescension has given us holy Scripture, therefore also it is, that though Christ Himself could write down nothing, His word has been reproduced for us in a γράμμα.[1] The question is not here about the respect which *the Jews* bore to Moses, and *their* dependence upon the written word (as de Wette says)—or as to *their* having been likely to put more faith in the writings than in words (as von Gerlach) —but Christ recognises here the universal requirement of authentic documents which God has already satisfied, and will yet further satisfy. He reproves them, as it were in passing, that this pædagogical condescension of the Divine testimony had been rendered vain by their perverseness; while at the same time He gives expression to His profound consciousness, that even after these *most mighty words filled with the Spirit* had been falling from His lips, they would be *for men such as they were*—no more than ῥήματα. Even yet more marvellous is the humility with which, after *such* a testimony to Himself, He places His own words in a certain sense *below* the writings of Moses. Only, however, in a certain sense; for on the other hand it bespeaks His sublime dignity, that He only speaks, and would not and will not write[2]—indeed more generally the relation of the New Testament to the Old is here already intimated. Everything legal and preparatory is better established, as it respects us, in writing or in the letter. But the Gospel could at *first* enter the human spirit only as a living word; the New Testament γράμματα are for ever in an impressive sense no other than ῥήματα; their *letter* as such can never hold the same place as the letter of Moses and the prophetical books.

The discourse leaves its final sentence unexpressed, but it involuntarily rises to our *thought*:—And *if* ye, radically unbe-

[1] And he who believeth not these γράμμασι, would no more believe, would *even less* believe, if the Lord Himself were to appear again, and speak His own words, and perform His own works, as then!

[2] Which is here *incidentally* declared: but essentially the words convey an intimation both that He Himself would not write immediately (which Hase calls "an accidental matter!"), and yet that He would order His words to be transmitted in writing.

lieving from the outset, with your wills averse, believe not these My *words*, how would you believe, if I were to heap miracle on miracle, every new wonder surpassing the last in confirmation of My words, instead of still *speaking* to you? The *Word* of the Son, as was said in ver. 34, is most distinctively that which avails for the quickening of the dead; the Father hath no agency beyond that for Israel or the world. Oh let us *believe* His *words*, as they are now written down for our good!

Many of our readers will not be displeased if we analyze the whole exposition, and arrange it systematically; those who dislike such methodizing, or think it unnecessary, may pass it over.

Jesus *bears witness to Himself* with a lofty dignity, in which is at the same time expressed His humility before the Father, and His love to mankind:—He Himself testifies to His Divinity of *operation* as the *Son* in the unity of the Father, as shown in *quickening* and *judgment* being put into His hands. The great position of ver. 17, involving in itself all that was afterwards developed, is laid down with the foresight that explanation would be required by His hearers. Then follows with ver. 19 the testimony which obviates and replies to all misunderstanding and opposition, falling into *three* divisions:—a vindication of Himself which corrects their error, passing into a continuous assertion of His claims (ver. 19–29);—a reproving reference to the extant *testimonies of the Father*, which they had not believed (vers. 30–40);—a *warning* resting upon the ground and consequence of this *unbelief*.

The *first part* gives us:

1. The continuous corrective *assertion*, in itself:—The Son doeth (*now*) only the works which have been shown and given to Him of the Father (ver. 19)—*for* the Father showeth Him *all things*, and yet greater things (ver. 20)—even the two *greatest*, the first and last, all-comprehending works, Quickening and Judgment (vers. 21, 22)—in order that the Father's honour may rest upon the Son. (Ver. 23.)
2. A more direct development of this in *confirmation;* which already passes over into the evidence for it, inasmuch as it promises the experimental proof, now internal, and in the future external. Ver. 24 stands at the head as the

fundamental position, and this is then pursued into detail—

A. For those who now *believe*—*Already* the dead live through the Son of God (vers. 25, 26), through Him to whom as the Son of man judgment is given (ver. 27), that is, for them the judgment of mercy;—but also

B. For those who *believe not*, in contrast with them, *in the future!* The last, complete distinction and separation between consummate *life* and the *condemnation* which remains. (Vers. 28–30.)

The *second part* embraces:—

1. The general *appeal* to the testimony of the Father, attached to the previous assertion now repeated. (Vers. 30–32.)
2. The particular *exhibition* of that testimony in its progressive order—

A. The Father testified, first of all, by *John*, who is not to be regarded as man, but as sent from God for their salvation, though he was met by unbelief only. (Vers. 33–35.)

B. The Father *Himself* testifies with a *greater* witness, that is, most immediately and essentially, by the *works* of the Son, which themselves confirm the word of John; but these works are not met by the hearing or seeing of those who had never from the beginning received the *word*—of all preceding testimonies. (Vers. 36–38.)

In this is the transition to the third witness.

C. The Father testifies, further, by that continuing testimony of *Scripture*, the *greatest* witness for man (through which alone the works of the Son can be fully apprehended and understood). It only remains to *refer them over* to *this* witness, while it is confirmed, and the principle of unbelief in it detected, which is the aversion of the will. (Vers. 39, 40.)

Thus the way is paved to the *third part*, in which:—

1. The *ground* of unbelief is exhibited in its expression—the rejection of Jesus (and the predicted acceptance of another). (Vers. 41–44.)
2. Its *consequence*, the judgment and condemnation springing from itself must be held up to their view. (Ver. 45.)

3. Once more the Lord returns to the first and, inasmuch as it lays the foundation for all which follows, the most *important witness* of Scripture—Moses preeminently, both as lawgiver and prophet (ver. 46); and to the *deepest principle* of unbelief—want of sincere submission to the law (in a trusting acceptance of the promise which ever accompanied it). (Ver. 47.)

TESTIMONY TO THE PEOPLE AFTER THE MIRACULOUS FEEDING. JESUS HATH THE BREAD OF LIFE; THE EATING AND DRINKING HIS FLESH AND HIS BLOOD.

(Ch. vi. 26–58.)

We have already expounded the historical introduction to this, and the words which were spoken in connection with the narrative, when treating the synoptical account in Matt. xiv.—see vol. ii. We are not willing to commit ourselves to a minute investigation of the transition, vers. 22–24, to the discourse in which our Lord gave His instruction to the people who sought Him after the miracle;—for the account of the Evangelist is plain enough upon the main point. We hold to the reading ἰδὼν, and understand it with an emphasis—When the people were convinced by the evidence of their eyes; and regard ὅτε οὖν εἶδεν as resuming it after the parenthesis of ver. 23. The entire narration with its prolixity (according to Baumgarten-Crusius, much in the tone of the people who speak in it) bears upon it the unmistakeable stamp of the most rigid historical truth; and this should help to justify the following discourse, so mercilessly debated over by our modern frivolous criticism. It is not that the Evangelist is in any sense unskilful in recording externals; but he designedly adopts this ordinary method of relating his story, in order to give the firm historical framework (completed in ver. 59) to the "hard saying" thus spoken to such a people. His expressions are classical Greek, if we take the terms as in a representation given from the people's point of view:—They saw that there *had been* no other ship there, and certainly knew that Jesus had not gone across in the same with the disciples. It was not till the next morning that the other boats came for their transit.

Wherefore did these people now *seek out* the Lord, and who were they distinctively? Certainly not the satiated five thousand in mass, for a fleet would have been requisite for their transport;[1] but, according to the plain limitation in ὁ ἑστηκώς, that portion only of the whole who would not submit to the ἀπολύειν, Matt. xiv. 23, but still clung to the repelling bread-king. Grotius: Qui substiterat in loco facti miraculi. Lange: The people which held out on the other side of the sea. Yet not so strongly defined as he would imply,—"only the fringe of the great family at the feeding,[2] the most elevated and importunate of the Chiliasts." Rather do we gather from ver. 30 that in their fruitless search "the first excitement which, after their abundant supply of food, would take Him and make Him a King, had cooled down, and they were now only curious to know how and when He had crossed the sea." (Brandt Schullehrerb.) They found Him on the other side, that is to say, already in the synagogue; for, from the first moment the colloquy goes on uninterruptedly, and it is highly artificial to interpolate at vers. 41–43 a transition to the synagogue. In the πότε of the question a πῶς must be understood, for the land journey round the margin of the lake would have been far too long for so short a time, especially in the night: and this comes forward still more emphatically in the ὧδε γέγονας (since when *art thou here?*) Thus does their sensual curiosity and lust of marvels seek into that miracle which had been secretly exhibited only to the disciples, but the Lord in His wisdom and dignity leaves their question unanswered (it was not for this people that He had gone over the sea); instead thereof He Himself gives them the answer to a counter-question which He might have put, and which would have been much more appropriate and useful had He put it—Wherefore seek ye Me? He points their attention to the sign

[1] What has been lately said, *e.g.*, by Sepp (iii. 16), of the multitude of ships which trafficked on the sea of Galilee, may be true enough; yet these thousands were not likely to find such a fleet ready for them on the instant.

[2] As it regards which Lange needs, for his interpretation of the "miraculous frame of mind," a more spiritual frame than we find; and no less than an evening-meal as at Cana. But this is contradicted by the governor of the feast there; and here by this same select company itself.

of the bread which they had eaten, and explains it—I Myself am the bread of *life!* In this fundamental idea the three great testimonies, chaps. iii.–vi., perfectly coincide with the present; but the progression appears in this, that now He who in His own person was the bread of life come down from heaven, and present among them, points nevertheless to a future (conditioned by His death) when first He would truly *give* Himself;—and, at the same time, in this, that now the susceptibility which must meet His offers, the hungering and thirsting sense of need in the heart, comes most prominently and strongly forward as a great condition. In chap. v. the discourse was *chiefly* addressed to the rulers and leaders of the people; now His words are pointed directly and expressly to the *people* themselves. Hence the character of this discourse coincides rather with chap. iv. than with chap. iii. But there is, moreover, a great difference in the progression of this present discourse. In the case of the more guiltlessly ignorant Samaritan woman the Lord *awakens* the sense of need in her heart; and His testimony dwells rather upon the fact that He can give *water* which will satisfy the inmost longing of the human desire. Here, however, He directly and with reason *rebukes* from the very beginning the want of true desire; and dogmatically represents Himself as the bread come down from heaven, in words which penetrate even to the deepest mysteries of the communication of His incarnate life. In all these relative differences we have pure witnesses to the historic truth of these discourses; the Evangelist, discerning the process of the Lord's teaching, and the process of the mind of the Spirit in it, has given them prominence as an essential abstract of the testimony of Jesus to Himself.[1]

Ver. 26. By His Ἀμὴν, Ἀμήν the reproving Searcher of hearts gives assurance at the very outset that He knows them far better than they are willing to know themselves. The Evangelist had rightly represented the seeing of the miracles—according to the superficial phraseology and meaning of men—as the

[1] We have given our views already, in the preface to the first volume, upon the treatise which Rauh has bestowed upon this chapter; a treatise written in the marvellous style of orthodox, apologetic criticism. It would lead to wearisome prolixity if we were to attempt to unweave his hyper-artificial confusion upon this simple history and discourse.

cause of their following and attaching themselves to Jesus; but the Lord's word now penetrates more deeply into the matter: He gives its right emphasis to the "*signs*," as in chap. iv. 48 He had given it to the "*seeing*." "Ye have seen, yea even eaten, but ye have not understood the significance of the miracle, so as to derive from it the knowledge of Me, and thus truly *seek*, in order to *believe on Me*, ver. 29." Even that ἁρπάζειν to make Him a king was truly no evidence of faith, and such coming to Him as the Lord requires; rather was it at the root a presumptuous and selfish aim—to make the Divine subservient to the ends of their own earthly desire, resting upon a state of central *unbelief* in His *true* majesty. Yet the Lord does not say ὅτι εἴδετε σημεῖον, but speaks in the plural; not merely meaning in addition the healing of the diseased mentioned in ver. 2, but everything generally that had been done, or had transpired, in connection with His work, as in ver. 36. For these men the bread was not a sign; but the sign was only—*bread!* The former signs were already forgotten; this last, by reason of the material utility which won their hearts, had not yet gone out of mind. The Lord rebukes them that the *eating* and *being filled*, in the most common sense, was the only thing of which they were capable; and says at the same time (against Lange) that they had yesterday *eaten* His miraculous bread in no better and higher disposition of mind. "I know well, that *that* was according to your mind; and that ye seek Me now if peradventure I may continue it!" They were like our modern men of industry, *utilitarians*, as Lange himself so far well calls them, and as Grotius had already said—in ipso miraculo utilitatem tantum hujus vitæ spectabant. And is it before *such* a people that the Lord penetrates so deeply into the mysteries of truth, and pours out those deep lessons over the interpretation of which even orthodox divines so often stumble and fall; even then most deeply falling when their misunderstanding or hyper-orthodoxy grows most zealous *in favour of* the mysteries themselves? Assuredly, but it is not so much the result of a previous plan of His own that the Lord thus speaks to such hearers, as that He is constrained by their ever-deepening contradiction to go on with His deepening mysteries; until He utters those hard sayings which bring about a sifting even in the narrower circle of His own dis-

ciples. He begins in a sufficiently conciliatory manner to speak of faith in Himself who will give the true bread; they then object to Him the manna of Moses, and *He may not retract or retreat*, must give up His truth to the contradiction of sinners (even as Himself to their hands), and not shrink to vindicate Himself as the true bread from heaven. *To this* also belongs simply that word concerning His *flesh*, ver. 31, which He still hesitatingly surrenders to them; and when they strive among themselves over that saying, He pronounces His judgments upon their proud minds, but yet in all humility and tenderness—for He gives them the most gracious disclosures, apparently only in vindication of Himself, or *as if* extorted from His humble and gracious truthfulness, concerning that sacred mystery which was afterwards to be sealed and confirmed to His friends and disciples in the sacrament of the last Supper. How could the Lord do otherwise than continue thus to yield up Himself and His truth? His love could never let the most perverse questioner go away unanswered; and, on the other hand, His wisdom foreknew to what purpose and use the despised words of His mouth in the synagogue of Capernaum would be put by the Father in the future history of Christianity.

Olshausen speaks, in his wonted manner, altogether too humbly and flatly concerning the Lord of glory:—"That *He might hope to be able*, by disclosing the full truth, to stimulate within them the germ of higher attainments; or should they remain impracticable, or should they become contentious, it would doubtless be *His wish* to repel them, and oblige them to go away!!" There is, however, some truth in this, when more becomingly expressed. But much more will arise hereafter to be considered, when we ask the question whether the "eating the flesh of the Son of man and the drinking His blood," is to be classed among the most intense, and highly-wrought figures of speech, or as the—*plain expression of a great truth which must not even thus early be kept back from the world.*

Ver. 27. The reproach which was spoken in the Indicative, as laying bare their secret hearts, is *followed* by the hortatory Imperative (which gives us another example, confirmatory of chap. v. 39). In that most general expression βρῶσις is the transition first made to a spiritual meaning; but there imme-

diately rises, as the case of this people required, the contrast between the two senses in all its strictness. The food of the body perisheth or passeth away—in the use of it in man himself, since the greatest part of it must again, as dead excrement, be rejected (Col. ii. 22; Matt. xv. 17): consequently there is nothing in it *living* or abiding; and if not used, it perisheth by corruption, etc. But how can that which itself perisheth, preserve the equally perishable and mortal bodily life of man from the power of death, and give a ζωὴ αἰώνιος! This passage must be understood just as 1 Cor. vi. 13. The ἐργάζεσθαι which is here chosen to correspond with ζητεῖν is first of all intended emphatically for the *first* clause, from which it then passes over to the second. Its meaning is originally *to gain by labour*, to get or acquire by diligence, see Lu. xix. 16; 2 Jno. 8, and in 1 Cor. ix. 6 it stands absolutely, to work for bread. Thence the derivative meaning—*to make a business* of, to engage in anything as a calling, mainly, that is, for the sustentation of life, as in Rev. xviii. 17, τὴν θάλασσαν, 1 Cor. ix. 13, τὰ ἱερά (as פעל with ב in Isa. xliv. 12). But neither of these meanings suits the idea here: the former certainly has no application to the earthly bread of this people, who would prefer to receive it *without* labour from the hand of Christ; and as it respects the heavenly bread, that is promised in δώσει. So that de Wette's translation, *erwirket*, is altogether false! The word here passes over into the general idea not merely of *procuring*, getting for themselves (Prov. xxi. 6 פֹּעֵל Theodotion), but—of *seeking to get*, troubling themselves about, making that an anxious concern. Yet must it not be reduced to a mere φροντίζειν (as Euthymius explains it); for it retains the idea of a wearisome effort on the part of man, a ποιεῖν and labour in order that it might be given, which applies also to the eternal food.[1] Schleiermacher very appropriately obviates the misunderstanding of ἐργάζεσθαι τὴν βρῶσιν τὴν μένουσαν to which Luther's translation might lead, by saying "that they on the preceding day had not themselves laboured for the perishable food; it was now their great

[1] Steinmeyer's homiletical exposition, on the other hand, is very artificial, according to which the *use* which we on our part make of the bread which is *given*, may be understood as a work! This must be in working up, *digesting* the food, but how does the language here used agree with it?

care and concern to get into their power and appropriate Him from whom they had received it." Thus the Lord's meaning is:—*Be quite as earnestly eager* to get for yourselves the true bread, make that your main business;[1] yea, seek Me, hold Me fast, but not as a bread-king, rather as the Feeder of your souls! Thus does He lay hold upon the minds of this people by this significant *middle-term* (de Wette—A word carefully chosen in order to the development of the discourse); though they afterwards might resent the reproof which had been administered in His use of it and say (as Pfenninger makes them say)—"What are we to mind in this world, if not our *bread?*"

His first address has, however, three divisions:—the reproach; the exhortation which springs from it; the *promise*, which shows them the right method of the desired ἐργάζεσθαι, in the believing, earnestly-anxious coming to Him who hath that better thing which is needful for them, to Him who was marked out by what He yesterday gave them as the Giver of the true gift. It is clear that ἣν does not refer to the ζωὴν (as has been supposed) but to the βρῶσιν. The future δώσει points indeed in the Lord's secret thought to that future of ver. 51 in which He will first fully give Himself by His death to be the life of the world; but now He generally invites those who hear Him, to eat of His bread, as Wisdom does in the Proverbs of Solomon, ch. ix. 5.[2] *For* while He names Himself the Son of man, He yet at the same time calls *God* His *Father;* this is the meaning of ὁ θεός as following after, the emphasis thus being—If I speak of the Father as My Father, hear it aright that He is God! The *God* from whom ye receive all good things, from whom ye should be eager to receive all good things, is My Father, who hath sent Me, the Son of man now standing in your presence, to give life to the world.[3] Σφραγίζειν, *seal* (rather erroneously in the

[1] For that the strong μὴ—ἀλλά does not literally forbid the working for daily bread, is clear of itself. Yet Epiphan. hær. 80 had to do with people who so perverted the Lord's word.

[2] As the Jewish phrase had the bread of *doctrine;* and the Rabbinical exegesis of such passages as Isa. iii. 1 points that way. Christ indeed *intended* much more from the very beginning!

[3] This view is more natural than that which makes πατήρ and θεός in *connection* with one another, stand for the designation of *willing* and *being able!*

German Bible "versiegeln," to seal up), that is, to confirm, approve, must have been at that time a customary and well-understood expression, as we here and at ch. iii. 33 observe. The Father hath marked out Jesus (as it were stamped); or authenticated and warranted Him by the *testimony of works* (ch. v. 35). This, however, is here as there not to be understood merely of the *miracles*, but of the *stamp of Divinity* which was impressed upon His whole life and working: comp. ch. x. 36 ἡγίασε.[1]

Although they do not fully understand the words of Jesus, yet those words were plain enough to make them observe at least whither they pointed. Those who answer Him are not necessarily, as has been said, the better portion of the multitude: the Evangelist assuredly always lays hold of those expressions of the individual speakers which most aptly represent the sentiments of the entire mass. But what do they mean by the ἔργοις τοῦ θεοῦ, which they so markedly substitute? There are expositors, though not much to be thought of, who meet from very different sides in one common and very strange interpretation. Not merely does Stolz translate—"what can we do, to work that which God alone should work?" but even Hess and Pfenninger have understood it very much the same, and Schleiermacher is persuaded that he must thus understand the words: "they admit that it is a work of God to give the imperishable bread, and ask Him how He could attribute to them the doing of that which God only could do; and what He could expect them to do, in order to accomplish a task which belonged only to God," which exposition, accepted by Meyer, Herder also received, though with a mocking turn—"How are we to do this? This we leave to God!" Schmieder also accedes to this view, though he somewhat modifies it when he paraphrases, "How are we to *procure* the means of nourishment for our souls, which God can only *prepare?*"[2] Yet we cannot agree with this interpretation; and though most learned commentators pass it over entirely, we think it of great moment to the meaning of the

[1] The Lord bears on His breast the high-priest's seal—קֹדֶשׁ לַיהוָה. Thus does the fundamental truth of that ancient, but generally rejected exposition, which traced here the χαρακτὴρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως, find its justification.

[2] Zeugniss von Christo in Predigten, S. 257.

answer which the Lord connects with their question, to pay attention to it and show its untenableness. Everything, when we narrowly look into it, is against this view. They must then have misunderstood the ἐργάζεσθαι as signifying to procure or create, which could not well be possible in connection with the bread in the desert; they rather by τί ποιῶμεν indicate a better understanding than that the Lord had warned them against what they could not have done. On the other hand, they must have discerned the spiritual meaning of the βρῶσις, and its Divine origination, far better than we are at liberty to suppose. Indeed, the whole saying so interpreted would have been altogether too keen and ingenious for this people. Finally, if such had been their meaning, they must naturally have adopted the Lord's own word, and as He had spoken in the singular they must have continued with τὸ ἔργον. Assuredly, the ἔργα from the lips of Jews must be interpreted simply according to the general phraseology of the time, as referring to those "works" with which they were continually busy in the exercise of their devotion, in the endeavour after their own righteousness. Thus it is manifestly the *genitivus beneplaciti*, as it is termed, which follows, Ps. li. 19; Jer. xlviii. 10; 1 Cor. xv. 58.[1] It is very characteristic that they pass over the promise altogether, and fasten on the requirement; they understand thus much, that the Lord requires from them a diligent labour after righteousness, and express themselves consequently in the way which was familiar to them—What dost thou require from us with thy ἐργάζεσθαι? What are we to do then? But we doubt whether (as Lücke thinks) they mean actually and properly the works of the *law;* Lange meets the case better who says, "they now would see in Him a *lawgiver*"—instead, that is, of a Saviour bringing grace, they expect from Him *new* commandments. This alone is conformable with all that follows, particularly their setting up Moses in opposition; and only thus can we understand the answer of our Lord, which has been so often perplexed and perverted.[2]

[1] Nonnus appends quite rightly θεοτερπεῖ θεσμῷ.

[2] It will not do to detect, as Luthardt does, in the ἔργα τοῦ θεοῦ as spoken by *Jews*, the deep meaning of ποιεῖν τὴν ἀλήθειαν ch. iii. 21.

Ver. 29. We may confidently regard it as a misunderstanding and a misuse of this saying, to make it prove that God worketh faith in us. The Lord has been requiring from man an ἐργάζεσθαι, and such an interpretation is remote therefore from His meaning; nor would it be an answer to their question even *if* that had so intended τὰ ἔργα τοῦ θεοῦ. Even the arch-predestinarian Lampe cannot avoid perceiving that ἔργον τοῦ θεοῦ is intended in the sense of their question. It is very significant that our Lord opposes a *singular*[1] to their plural; and faith to their works as the *one, true foundation-work*, from which all works well-pleasing to God must proceed (in its deepest sense quite in harmony with Rom. iii. 27, 28);—He replies to their τί ποιῶμεν by πιστεύετε, just as His Apostle afterwards does. Schleiermacher: "I do not know that there can be found even in the writings of the Apostle a passage which more plainly and expressly teaches us that the whole imperishable life of man's soul proceeds from *faith in Christ*, and that nothing but this faith lies at its foundation; a faith, *from which proceeds every other good thing acceptable to God.*" Yes, verily, this is the evangelical answer to all legal questioning. But faith is itself called a work, and that not catachrestically in deference to the question concerning works: it is itself no other than "the true, God-appointed work, the substance of the first commandment, it is a law in obedience."[2] Comp. Jas. i. 25, ποιητὴς ἔργου (not ἔργων) and ἐν τῇ ποιήσει αὐτοῦ.

To those who imagine that the Lord, by implication, would pass over to the *genitivus causæ* also at the same time, we can only say that whatever truth there is in that (Eph. i. 19; Col. ii. 12; Phil. i. 6, etc.) belongs not to this passage; for *this* meaning the expression would be too strong, and the saying would be here in the whole Scripture a ἅπαξ λεγόμενον—that our faith is the work of God in us! In Eph. ii. 8 salvation is the *gift*, but faith the instrument of its reception on the part of

[1] The significance of which distinction Luthardt should not have denied (Stud. u. Krit. 1852, 2)!

[2] Nitzsch, die Gesammterscheinung des Antinomismus, Stud. u. Krit. 1846, 1, 69. Lange:—"Faith is a work of man from God, in and through God, and for God; and therefore it is as well God's work as it is *the highest, freest work of man.*" (Leben Jesu iii. 603.)

man; according to 1 John iii. 23 it is the *commandment* of God to us that we believe, and no other can be the design of ἵνα πιστεύσητε in this passage. At most might it be said, as Hess cautiously puts it, "that which God worketh in you can be accomplished only through *your* believing," or—"God is *for that* always providing and working, and ye should enter into His purpose by a reciprocal ἐργάζεσθαι." This latter view might be in some sense justified by the ἵνα, if stress is laid upon it (to that end God worketh, that); but it does not respond to the question. The former scarcely can be reconciled with τοῦτό ἐστι. Turning from all this let us rather mark in this saying the theme of the whole discourse, as it connects *believing* and *eating;* not, indeed, identifying them, but plainly declaring that he only who believes will be willing and able to eat of that meat which is unto everlasting life. If we ask after *our* ποιεῖν ἵνα—it is absolutely no other than believing, coming, receiving. If *we* ask (which the Jews, however, on this occasion did *not*) after the work of God in us, *then* we say that in another sense this is *His* ἔργον, to feed our souls with Christ, and on Christ, His Son.

However perverse and to be condemned were the meaning and spirit of these contradicters in the rejoinder which now follows, yet it was so ordered under Divine guidance that their folly should be the foundation upon which the Lord would raise a testimony thus extorted from Him by the false representatives and adherents of the Old Testament. We may say, indeed, that these Jews themselves gave to Jesus the most appropriate subject which the occasion required; inasmuch as He now, as *opposed to Moses*, can so much the more plainly and convincingly testify of that bread of life for the world which, from this time forward, was present among them—and in the form of simple reply and vindication of Himself.

"Dost Thou assert Thyself to be sent of God after and above Moses—how canst Thou prove that, what sign showest Thou?" Here do these people show themselves to be no better than those Pharisees who elsewhere desired the sign from heaven, after having seen so many signs; and we regard this as quite natural and consistent with the narrative. It is quite unnecessary and incorrect to refer this to *others*, and not those who yesterday would

make Him a king if so He might be made further *subservient to their purposes.*[1] The entire account has nothing to do with any others, from ver. 26 downwards. The Lord has now excited them, given them offence, and pointed them to that better thing which they desired not; they remain wavering for a while, vibrating between better and worse impulses, until, finally, unbelief keeps the field. If, in ver. 28, there was something responsive to our Lord's words, that has now passed away, and in vers. 30, 31, they go to the opposite extreme. We cannot, with many (Ebrard last of all), discover here a continuation, according to which a *request* underlay the question—"*Give* us then that better, everlasting bread; give us *this sign first*, then will we believe"—for this would be perversely to invert His requirement that they should first believe. No, that does not come till ver. 34. Still less may their saying be explained, with Lange—"they *confide in Him* that He might take them under His care, even as Moses had their fathers, but they are not willing to expect anything less from Him than they received from Moses; *He must continue in the same path and provide for them fully and entirely.* Such confidence and such expectation would amount to the very πιστεύειν αὐτῷ which they declined; but it is the boldness of unbelief which speaks here most strongly in the ἐργάζῃ of unbelief, which, having seen much, will see more, and which here gives back His own word to the Lord with a clumsy perversion—"What are the works of God which Thou workest, to constrain us to accept from Thee Thy doctrine and laws, to guide us in our works? We *see* not the sealing of which Thou speakest, in anything that hath taken place yet!"[2] The new sign must be from heaven, but naturally enough something good for them on earth—nothing else does this people desire; and as the matter in question is bread and feeding, the

[1] So Neander: "Thus others came forward; for it is part of John's manner not closely to distinguish individuals in his narrations, but to group them in masses." But this cannot, thus absolutely and without qualification, be maintained.

[2] Berlenb. Bib. rightly thus—"so dull and so audacious is man!" Brückner opposes this emphasis, and says that the σύ which would justify it is wanting; but there is no force in this, as the antithesis is plain enough in the connection, and the σύ of the former clause passes on to the second.

manna given by Moses in the wilderness comes aptly to their minds. And should He have given them manna too? Signs heaped upon signs, one approving the other, give no evidence to the unbelief which is of the heart; as had long ago been seen in their fathers. The more God thus gratifies their love for wonders, the more insatiably will they desire to see more.

We have here a normal passage for the distinction between πιστεύειν εἰς and the mere πιστεύειν τινί. It was the former which the Lord desired, but they will not even concede to Him the latter. "If we are to attach ourselves to Thee as another Moses, or to place Thee even above him, and devote ourselves entirely to Thee according to Thy word—then perform some sign as great as, or greater than those of Moses." This, from the point of view of their *hardness of heart*, is not an altogether stupid requirement, but the true philosophy which, in its opposition to the revelation of God, is never wanting to unbelief.[1] We may imagine how highly the Jews thought of the *Manna*, the θεῖον καὶ παράδοξον βρῶμα according to Josephus, the θαυματουργούμενον καὶ τεράτιον ἔργον according to Philo, when we find that Aben Esra calls it the greatest of the miracles of Moses, and read in the thoughtful book of Wisdom so romantic a diatribe upon it, ch. xvi. 20, 21. (And Nonnus has—μάννα πολυκλήϊστον.) "Our fathers did eat manna in the desert, so many hundreds of thousands so many long years daily"—*against that fact* the food given by Jesus seems to them very insignificant, and especially when it was taken into account that that bread of Moses came *from heaven!* For this glorification of their Moses they have even a text of Scripture, they think themselves quite justified and impregnable. It is found (only that here ἐκ and φαγεῖν are added to strengthen it) literally in Ps. lxxviii. 24, with which may be compared Ex. xvi. 4, 15, and Ps. cv. 40. But these presumptuous quoters of Scripture forget, alas, or have never read and known, that this very Ps. lxxviii. is full of keen condemnation of their fathers' unbelief, and that the manna is there only coupled with the quails, in which their lust ate death! And they now were acting no better with regard to the miraculous bread

[1] Kleuker (Briefe über Herder S. 74) reminds us very aptly of Mendelssohn's requirement, that the law of Moses should be abolished in as emphatic and glorious a manner as that in which it was given.

of Jesus than their fathers had done, who were not contented with the manna, but wanted flesh also, yea, longed after their common bread and water again (Numb. xxi. 5). Their fathers had indeed believed Moses, before the manna was given, when he led them out of Egypt; but, after the manna was given, they believed him not. These wise ones know not what they say; and have only come to utter these words because the bread of life offered to them had thrown back their thoughts upon *eating* again—ἔφαγον and φαγεῖν is the limit of their ideas.

Vers. 32, 33. Instead of such correction of their error, and reproof of their perverseness, as would have been abundantly at His disposal, if the Lord had been disposed fruitlessly to dispute with them, He is contented with a calm and gentle denial that the manna was the bread from heaven, and a renewed offer of the bread which He Himself brought. His Ἀμὴν, Ἀμήν is opposed in the fulness of dignity to their unintelligent quotation of the γεγραμμένον. His declaration contains a threefold antithesis—It was not *Moses* who gave it you then; it was not that essential *bread* which I refer to; because *not from heaven.* The last contrast is that which comes into strong prominence; the second is only suggestively hinted in that; but the third must first claim our notice. For the Jews had not mentioned their *Moses*, but the emphatic σύ shows that they intended him; and hence, as the Lord well knew, their cited ἔδωκεν was referred to Moses, though in the Psalm, and in every passage of the Pentateuch, the sending down of manna and every gift is always attributed only to *God;* see, *e.g.*, Ex. xvi. 15. But this first opposing thought is immediately dismissed; and the emphasis falls now upon τὸν ἄρτον, not simply of itself according to Erasmus *illum* panem; but, as connected with ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, we must understand it as *denying* that that bread was from heaven in the higher and true sense, as the following verse shows. Moreover, *we* shall not take much time in proving to our readers that our Lord is very far from contradicting the testimony of the Old Testament, and from confirming the notion, now alas so prevalent, that the manna was altogether earthly in its origin.[1] If the manna had

[1] Bahrdt could thus maliciously read it: Ye good people, that which ye have said does indeed demand attestation. What if I asserted that that

actually been no more than a natural product of the earth marvellously increased every day ("the sap of an Arabian plant," says even Tholuck!), there would have been no meaning in its being laid up in the ark of the covenant. But the entire history, and especially the cited passage in the Psalm, maintains the contrary. As the substitute for the fruit of the earth it is called there דְּגַן־שָׁמַיִם; and in Ps. cv. 40 לֶחֶם שָׁמַיִם, which Aben-Ezra rightly interprets of the firmamental heaven—כִּי בַאֲוִיר יוֹלַד. But the parallel לֶחֶם אַבִּירִים points certainly, as the ancients interpreted, to the *angels;* not, that is, as if it was food common to men and angels, but, as this corn *grew* in heaven and not upon earth, so was it *prepared* by the service of the strong ministering spirits of God, and thus angel-bread, not bread of the baker. Comp. Wisd. xvi. 20 ἕτοιμον ἄρτον ἀκοπιάτως.[1] It was truly a יְצִירָה חֲדָשָׁה בַשָּׁמַיִם, as R. Bechai says, but this heaven of the firmament and the angels is not the heaven of the Father, from which the Son brings down the true bread, which endureth unto everlasting life. But the manna stank through the disobedience of the children of Israel, and preserved them not from dying in their sins; just as the miraculous food of Jesus had only *satisfied* the unbelievers as common food.

But why does the Lord in His answer say "you," instead of "your fathers?" First of all, because His declaration embraces that antithesis itself; but there is something more profound indicated thereby, which it imports us to understand, though the Jews when they heard it first were not likely to understand it aright. The Lord must necessarily in the deep workings of His mind speak with a wide reach and fulness of meaning; *His* thought on this occasion does not limit itself to the manna, but His design is to tell these contradicting *disciples of Moses*, whether they could seize His meaning or not:—"*Your* Moses, in giving manna to the fathers, and generally in giving *you* the law, and all that it was in his power to give, neither gave you bread, nor any *living power*, nor any new remedy from heaven *against death, the wages of sin.*" *Therefore* He makes prominent the name of Moses first, and places the δέδωκεν ὑμῖν and the

manna which the Jehovah of Moses (not my Father!) gave, was not from heaven at all?

[1] See further in our comment. on Ps. lxxviii.

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA.

δίδωσιν ὑμῖν in such simple and comprehensive contrast. We can scarcely doubt that *some* who retained this saying in their minds, and pondered it well, would afterwards find this meaning in it.

The true bread from heaven is a bread of *God*, the Father; preeminently bread *which cometh down from heaven*, and in a much higher sense than that in which it is said of the typical and unreal bread that, when the dew fell, the manna came down upon it. (Numb. xi. 9 יָרַד, LXX. κατέβαινε.) This parallel in contrast shows of itself that the descriptive adjective ὁ καταβαίνων belongs to ἄρτος; and that we must not (with von Gerlach and Olshausen, who opposes Lücke on this point) make it the subject of the proposition: *He* is the bread of God, *who* cometh down from heaven, that is to say, Myself. That does indeed lie in the background of the subject, but does not yet shape itself into words; for it is in ver. 35 that the new, great utterance begins—ἐγώ εἰμι; see also in ver. 38 the καταβέβηκα, and in ver. 41 the καταβάς which *then* the Jews rightly deduce from our present καταβαίνων; and further in the Lord's words, vers. 50, 51, the significant distinction by which the καταβαίνων is attached to the ἄρτος as descriptive, and to Himself the καταβάς—all finally in ver. 58 coinciding and terminating in the καταβάς alone.

We cannot, indeed, strictly affirm it nowhere else to be said that the Lord "is ever coming down" from heaven, but that He hath once for all come down. He says καταβέβηκα, but never what has no meaning—ἐγὼ καταβαίνω.[1] But the middle term καταβαίνων hangs on to the typical element in the manna, according to which the καταβαίνειν ever continuing was certainly prefigurative. The fulfilment of the type, however, in the μάννα ἀληθινόν goes beyond the type in every relation and point of view:—Christ *giveth life*, does not merely sustain the temporal life for a season, but brings anew eternal life; and furthermore He giveth it to the whole *world*, not to the one race in the wilderness![2] That word was most assuredly spoken concerning Him-

[1] Comp. Hofmann, Schriftbeweis i. 118.

[2] Here and ch. xiv. 31 the *world* designates believers! (*e.g.*, according to Flacius). But life is ready *for* all. More than that is not said, only that all the world, *if* believing and eating, might receive life.

self as the σωτὴρ τοῦ κόσμου; so that He might well proceed, when the Jews lingered upon His *giving* (δώσει, ver. 27), to say to them—"Do ye not understand in what sense I speak this? I Myself *am* that bread! I Myself, standing before you, am the greatest sign from heaven, the wonder of all wonders;—he who believeth Me, and believeth on Me, will *inwardly experience* that it is so!" Thus there is once more the appealing and urging reference to that one and alone sufficing evidence of experience. But where the craving of the heart's necessity is not found, unbelief can behold the works of God and yet ask for more, demands evermore new signs, understanding not those which have been already abundantly given, neither the old nor the new.

Thus was it with these Jews, who well knew that which they did *not* want, but not *that which* they did require, in this their demand. The word which they now interject, ver. 34, is quite rightly placed in juxtaposition with the similar one of the Samaritan woman, chap. iv. 15; though there was probably much less of the impulse of faith in their "Lord, evermore give us this bread" than in her "Sir, give me this water." There is enforced from them just so much apprehension and recognition of what the Lord had spoken, that they remain in embarrassment, desirous of saying something and not knowing what else to say. We cannot, however, detect in their words any evil-minded *mockery*—"Thou dost promise great things, but if we take Thee at Thy word, Thou wouldst be fain to let alone giving us *that* bread"[1]—for the κύριε of itself (more than ῥαββί, ver. 25) opposes that notion; and in that case the Searcher of hearts would not have entered into further colloquy with them, at least such as we afterwards find. But still less is it a "childlike expression;" although the Evangelist thus symbolically sets it before us, that *we* may, with full purpose and earnestness of heart, pray in such terms for that which they lightly and with perplexed minds demanded.

Vers. 35, 36. The Lord, who maintained throughout the whole of this conversation the utmost forbearance of condescen-

[1] Lampe cites some of the fathers for this view, which Baumgarten-Crusius shows to be a mistake. Calvin, however, did so interpret it, and others after him.

sion, now speaks to them a word which at once gives them a full explanation in answer to their request, just as if it had been earnestly intended, and yet withholds not the assurance that He well knows their unbelief. Just as in chap. v. 30 He made the transition from the indirect form of speech to the ἐγώ, so He does also here; for, from this point we find no less than thirty-five times this ἐγώ, or μοῦ, μοί, μέ. They hold fast their misunderstood *giving*, but He can only give to those who believe on Him, He therefore proceeds—"Yea, verily, I would gladly give it to you, but in order to that ye must first recognise that I personally *am* that bread which cometh, or rather is come, *from heaven*, this bread *of God* for the life of the world, this *bread of life*." Here we perceive a threefold gradation in the expression, the significant deepening of which we may profitably ponder. In ζωῆς is embraced the two ideas that He is, and hath life, in Himself; and that He giveth it in and from Himself (ζῶν, ver. 51, and ζωὴν διδούς, vers. 33, 54). *Bread* is the universal food, nourishment, sustentation of life generally. We have already shown, upon chap. iv. 14, in what sense the promise of no more hungering and thirsting holds good. The πώποτε responds in gracious corroboration to their πάντοτε; but that He, when speaking of bread, includes another figure and refers to thirst, is not an empty tautology, but founded upon more than one important principle.[1] For, first of all, hungering and thirsting embraces, as a phrase (as Rev. vii. 16, after Isa. xlix. 10), all the individual needs and all the unsatisfied desires of man, in their complex and manifold variety. And then it is not without significance that the manna in Ex. xvii. is said only to satisfy the hunger of the people, and not the thirst which immediately was excited after eating the bread from heaven; for thus we understand that this true bread from heaven far surpasses every preparatory and typical supply of man's need. Finally, we acknowledge, for our own part, that the Lord seems to us to have already in His secret thought that meaning of "eating and drinking" which, in immediate con-

[1] Whether, as Braune thinks, there is a designed reference here to the similar conversation with the woman of Samaria, we must leave undecided: the word must have its own appropriate meaning here in connection with the hungering.

nection with His own body and blood, He is constrained afterwards to dilate upon more fully. But that in the whole it is only a spiritual satisfaction and supply of need that is intended, is manifest from the imposition of *faith* as the sole condition. According to ver. 30 they promised their faith when they should *see;* to that He now proceeds to attach His words, but meets them by an allusion to the true *seeing*, which differed from theirs. The first καί is an *etsi*, but the ἑωράκατε does not simply mean—Ye have seen signs (He disclaims this in relation to them in ver. 26); for the με is certainly the right reading. "Ye have often and long enough seen *Myself* (which is more than My individual miracles); the light of My life and work, the light of My whole manifestation hath shone upon you, and yet have ye not rightly seen, ye do not truly believe!" This He had said to them in effect, vers. 26 and 29—though Alford improperly regards this allusion as far-fetched. Any more *distant* reference to what other hearers had heard (as ch. v. 37, 38) is quite inappropriate; and so is any "flaw in the narrative" which (as Lücke says) would entail on the Evangelist the opprobrium of connecting together as one discourse sayings uttered at different times.

Vers. 37, 38. The most immediate connection of these words with the preceding is to be sought in this, that the Lord, just as in ch. v., proceeds to disclose the secret ground of their not believing, their disobedient resistance to the drawing of the Father; exhibiting this, however, in the most gracious manner, and appending to the reproof a new and most benignant *promise* for every one who yet might believe and come to Him. We may also penetrate deeper and say with entire propriety, at the same time, that the Lord is consoling His own spirit in the Father's presence by the reflection that with all the unbelief which prevailed there could not and would not fail to be some given unto Him: He encourages His own soul to wait for every individual who might come to Him. Yea we may further say—so widely and luminously do these general expressions throw their beams around—that He is speaking in a *disclaiming tone* at the same time: "I receive only what comes to Me as the gift of the Father; *your* trustless dependence upon Me, springing from the desire of bread, *your* interested and carnal seeking, avails not with Me!"

The *neuter* πᾶν, preceding as it does, is of great significance. In its extent of meaning it refers back to the κόσμος of ver. 33; but more specifically embraces (as in ch. xvii. 2, comp. also 1 Jno. v. 4) the whole body of those who come to the Son as one integral whole in itself, so contemplated and foreseen; and, at the same time, maintains a deep universal principle which underlies the character of each individual of the chosen, and makes all one—so far concurring with ch. iii. 6. The Saviour of the world,—who, according to His humanity, must pour out, like Isaiah His type, His appeals and invitations to a stiffnecked people, with unwearied labours which might almost seem to be experimented "in vain"—has yet as the *Son*, who is never independent of the Father, at the same time the clearest and most serene contemplation of, or insight rather into, that problem, the hardest of all to our theory and practice, of the mysterious ἐκλογή. He beholds even here already, with unveiled countenance, the eternal counsel, even to its utmost goal in the salvation of the ends of the earth (Isa. xlix. 3–6); but now in conformity with His κένωσις He beholds it, as it were, in the spirit of faith and obedience. In general He has a fixed knowledge that *all* must and *will* come to Him which the Father giveth to Him; but as it respects the individuals He receives *each* as he comes as a new, and, as it were, unforeseen gift, the slight earnest and first-fruits of His labour and toil. And that this δίδωσι is used, and not δέδωκε (differently from ch. xvii. which regards all from the point of view of the consummation of all) of itself secures us, if we rightly understand it, against any predestinarian perversion of the meaning. This *giving*, when viewed apart from the Divine knowledge of all His works from the foundation of the world, embraces a work which even before the Father is ever progressively going on to its consummation through individual instances one after another. If we take into account all other testimonies to the love of God and His willingness to save all the world, it will be perceived that He who giveth His Son to all, wills also to give all to the Son; so that we are to understand here—all which He *can* give. This is confirmed past all doubt by the declaration which follows in ver. 44; for the giving and the drawing of the Father are one, as is shown once more in ver. 65. (Comp. ch. xvii. 6, 9, 11.) "He giveth

them over to the charge of the Redeemer" is saying too little, for this expresses only the result of this preventing grace; to this also belongs all the pædagogic preparation to that end, and indeed the latter is more especially signified. The voluntary *coming*, at the same time, to the Son in faith (hence the fut. ἥξει), is now at the first the fruit of the Old Covenant gathered in; but the Son receiveth every one so won, and so given to Him, with joy.[1] Τὸν ἐρχόμενον now places the individual who *at any time* comes more strongly and concretely over against the πᾶν; and, in the promise of not casting out, there lies a most gracious and affecting *Litotes*—How should I otherwise than take him to My arms, and bear him rejoicingly on My shoulders? Tholuck and Lücke refer this to the elsewhere mentioned exclusion from His kingdom, but this seems to us scarcely to suit the present deeper circle of ideas; nor does the expression include any reference to that absolute preservation of the soul so received, of which ver. 39—as also ch. x. 28—first speaks. The Lord's meaning exhibits here simply the assurance that if, in the midst of so much unbelief, there comes here and there one, the right one, given to Him of the Father, He will assuredly not reject or cast him away—"even if he comes ever so creepingly" (as the Berlenb. Bibel says). Thus do we rightly hold fast that meaning of the word which the Holy Spirit has impressed upon the souls of so many from age to age for their full assurance in coming to Christ. As the Lord prospectively *comforts* all who should come, and throws open the door wide to their coming, so also, as we before said, He encourages Himself to this persevering readiness to receive them all. Schleiermacher says gracefully and well: "He utters this word Himself, that, however long men may neglect it, however long it may be that they see and hear, and yet believe Him not, when they *do* finally come, He cannot, and will not, and must not cast them away."

For how should He not *receive* what comes to Him as given of the Father? This is the corroboration of the thought which the following words yet more expressly afford. As to the general statement of ver. 38 in itself, compare chs. iv. 34, v.

[1] Nonnus adds: ἀλλὰ νόῳ χαίροντι δεδέξομαι.

30. As to its relation to the context here, ver. 39 must be considered in connection with it. Pfenninger says—"How should I cast any one out, when for the very purpose of receiving him I came down from heaven"—that is, of receiving, preserving, and guiding to glory all who are thus given to Me. "*Not Mine own will*—for My personal human will is merged into the Divine will of the Father; *the love of God is in Me*, an impartial and universal love; *it is not in Me*[1] to receive or reject arbitrarily, or to make any difference between those who come. I discern in the coming of every man, and even in the slightest advances towards it, the being given Me of the Father."

Vers. 39, 40. The will of the Father, the counsel of His redeeming grace through His Son, embracing all that are to be saved, and therefore actually are saved, is now openly declared and firmly attested; in ver. 39 as it regards its final goal; and in ver. 40 as it regards, once more, the present *beginning* towards that glorious consummation. We would prefer, with Griesbach, Knapp, and Lachmann, the reading γάρ instead of the repetition of δέ in ver. 40; and πατρός μου must stand for πέμψαντός με, the πατρός being omitted in ver. 39. All and every one that is given is, to the Son as to the Father, a precious and beloved possession to be kept most diligently; therefore will He, according to the will of the Father, bestow the most faithful care and solicitude that He *lose* nothing and not one, ch. xvii. 12, xviii. 9. If we should be disposed to understand ἀπολέσω here—"I will not destroy (but take care of, heal and save)"—that would be indeed a strengthening of the previous Litotes μὴ ἐκβάλω ἔξω, but its tone would be too harsh to be suitable here, and we cannot consent to that interpretation. (The word as used in Lu. ix. 56 is something very different, being addressed particularly to the disciples.) But to translate it—"I will not permit them to perish or be lost (ch. x. 28)," embraces too much, and weakens the tender pathos of the thought hitherto expressed, which has been simply this—that the lost sheep now found, and led back by the drawing of the Father to the good Shepherd, are *His own*, and that He could

[1] Richter's Hausbibel—Christ hath no arbitrary, electing human will.

not, nor would, *lose* them again, for His own sake and His Father's. Thus the μὴ ἀπολέσω corresponds strictly with the δέδωκε, and is the proper expression for the sense of φυλάσσειν, comp. ch. xii. 25.

But the will of the Father is itself conditioned by *faith;* and the ground, beginning, and distinctive test of faith lies in the true *hearing*, as it is said elsewhere, or, as it is said here with the same meaning, in the true seeing, recognising, understanding, and accepting the Son. It is clear enough that θεωρῶν (Syr. דְחָזֵא לַבְרָא) signifies much more now than the fruitless having seen of ver. 36. It is itself the beginning of believing, but is not on that account one and the same with it; just as further the receiving and enjoying of eternal life is only the consequence and fruit of believing. Let us carefully distinguish those three critical points,—the germ, and the fruit, of the πιστεύειν in the centre; in order that we may have a key to the right understanding of the entire discourse, and not *superficially* attach everything which the Lord says to simple "believing," without any further qualification. Certainly, to cast our glance forwards for a moment, *believing* in vers. 40 and 54 stands quite parallel with *eating and drinking*, the same promise being attached to both of ἔχειν ζωὴν αἰώνιον; but the eating is not on that account the same thing with believing, or conversely,—*the believing makes the soul capable of and ready for the eating.* Roos said most pertinently and clearly: "He who cometh to Him in faith will no more suffer hunger or thirst. Wherefore? Because the faith which comes is a faith which *enjoys*, or because something to eat and to drink is given to him who comes. This eating and drinking is just something which faith has to do, if it will obtain satisfaction or the enjoyment of eternal life." We say once more what was said on chap. iii. in connection with the new birth—Think not too lightly of faith, it must lead to and become the eating of Christ! But think not too hardly of this eating, it takes place through simple faith! Or otherwise—Believing is our ἐργάζεσθαι and ποιεῖν, to which the food which God gives is apportioned. Augustin's celebrated expression (on ver. 29 above) *Crede et manducasti!* does indeed properly enough oppose the "parare dentes et ventrem;" but, if rigorously taken, would set aside the sacrament in itself, if not as found in John

vi., as a πάρεργον. We would say instead—Crede *et manducabis;* this alone is strictly true![1]

Let us go back, however, to the text, as far as we have yet explored it. The raising up at the last day,[2] twice emphatically affirmed, points out to us the final goal of salvation and preserving power, after the attainment of which there is no more danger of perishing, or losing again that eternal life which is now, the body also being raised, consummate. The promise is in its true meaning similar to that which is uttered in chap. xi. 25—He shall *live* though He (apparently again) die! Even death shall not prevail against him! "In the interview with the woman of Samaria, Jesus did not proceed beyond the representation of Himself as spiritual, living water, which refreshes and sustains *the soul;* here He already intimates that He is about to go further, and to describe Himself as the Restorer and Transformer of the *entire man,* even of the body." (Olshausen.) We add, even as He already went so far in chap. vi.; and would entreat every intelligent reader to take *this* as the first key to the understanding of the whole of the subsequent discourse concerning the Lord's *flesh and blood.* He who does not recognise the *glorified corporeity* of the resurrection as the goal of all God's dealings with the children of men delivered from the bondage of death,—he who does not see that in order to the victory of grace over sin, the restitutio in integrum of fallen man, something would be eternally wanting if bodily death was not also vanquished, so that the ἀνάστασις alone consummates the ζωή—and further that this restoration can come to us only through the *body* of the second Adam, the man from heaven, first glorified—he who does not apprehend all this, will never understand either the Lord's Supper itself, or the testimony which the Lord here gives of its deep foundation and principle.

Inasmuch as ἀναστήσω forms the antithesis of ἀπολέσω, it includes, what indeed lies essentially in the word itself, the idea of a full presentation. If any one, however, would therefore say—

[1] And Calvin comes near to this when he protests against other expositors—Illis manducatio est fides, mihi ex fide potius consequi videtur.

[2] The keen-sighted Baumgarten-Crusius, like Hezel, makes this to be the new Messianic time generally;—Reuss no less than the last day of every believer!

"the ἀναστήσω does not mean *I will raise them up from the dead*, but *will present them as saved*, without any diminution or loss"[1]—that would be to err from the plain meaning of the word, and the constant phraseology of Scripture. We may not however despise, in such a case, the Zugleich (at the same time) of Meyer's note, offensive as it is to many of our School divines; we may contemplate the pregnant fulness of meaning without instituting foolish contrasts; and in the present instance agree with Lücke's exposition—"Will present them fully in the glory of the resurrection."

Let us learn, further, to observe how necessarily and naturally the words of God, when put into human language, assume various meanings in various relations. In ch. v. 29 an ἀνάστασις is predicated also of the evil; but we saw there that this is only asserted in their case by a kind of irony, since it is rather the consummation of their *death* into eternal. Here, on the other hand, the pure idea of a true *resurrection* unto fully restored life exhibits itself in the ἀνάστασις, just as in ch. xi. 25; and it would be exceedingly wrong on that account, either to deny to the wicked that other resurrection in its kind in this word, or to deduce from it that *all* will finally be saved, since all will be finally raised up, and that the Lord intends here to assert this.[2]

Vers. 41, 42. The Lord might now, humanly speaking, have closed His testimony with these words, if a yet more far-reaching and stimulating continuation of it had not been *enforced* from Him. Though we might humanly say, with the same propriety,

[1] Kleuker in the treatise—Johannes, Petrus and Paulus als Christologen, Riga 1785. S. 107.

[2] Thus two very different men, one of them, however, scarcely in exegetical earnest. Schleiermacher: "What else can we infer from these words but that He hath given all men to the Son; since if only some are raised up, the Father would not have given Him all, or if the Father had not given Him all, all would not then be raised up!" Joh. v. Müller brings the same from ver. 37—"Ye will finally all come to Me, for the Father hath given Me all, and therefore hath given Me you. Ver. 38: I would draw now even you to Me, but that is not in the Father's plan as yet, your hour is not yet come!" This is to forget the whole of the remaining Scripture in considering our passage, and to interpret even that capriciously. For how is it said in ver. 37 that the Father hath given all to Him?

that He had clearly foreseen this influence of His words and the turn which they would give to the people's thoughts. The *οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι* now first occurring has unnecessarily caused much hesitation to expositors: simple readers will immediately understand that the same persons are referred to who have been speaking before. Lampe was prepared with his "facile mihi persuadeo" for the opinion that another detachment had left the *ὄχλος* before referred to; and Lange accepts this with the qualification that a specific "judaising or pharisaic party" among the people is now indicated as having come forward. But what necessity is there for this? It seems to us in every case an artificial resource, and to be contradicted here by the fact that St John reckons the Galilæans also in mass with the *Jewish people* opposing Jesus; see also later, ch. x. 19, 24. As their fathers *murmured* in old time, so do *these* Jews murmur now.[1] Their objection is not taken so much against His calling Himself the bread of life in and of itself, but against the *καταβαίνων ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ* asserted in connection with it, which in ver. 38 had been magnified into *καταβέβηκα*. Not now affected by any Jewish or Galilæan notions about the Messiah generally, which indeed are involved in ch. vii. 27 but not in this passage, they have to do only with His asserted *καταβέβηκα*; they understand this, and quite rightly, of a mysterious origination of His humanity, different from ordinary generation—in this being far more true and profound in their apprehension than many of our recent divines.[2] Against this they object a ready and dogmatic *οἴδαμεν*—without reflecting, however, that it was with them as with those others,

[1] Baur and Hilgenfeld go very much too far when they say that *Ἰουδαῖοι* in this Evangelist is just synonymous with—enemies of Christ!

[2] "As long as the *ground* of faith in Him and the ground of hope is sought in anything external, in the manner in which His earthly life began, or in any external circumstances in which He differed from other men, so long are we not in the right way to believe." This assertion of Schleiermacher is half *true*, but only *half*, for *as* something external the miraculous birth of Christ is not the ground of faith; it is not, moreover, anything external at all, and its truth follows from faith in Him. Not merely—"the true and living faith will say to itself, it is just so as it is written in our holy books, *but it might have been otherwise*" *(?)*—but better with Nitzsch—"from the deepest ground of the testimony that He came forth from the Father, and generally from faith in the

ch. vii. 42, in their erroneous conclusion based upon the birth of Christ in Bethlehem—the notorious fact, as they thought it, that He was only a man born in the ordinary manner, whose dead father and still surviving mother they knew. Περὶ αὐτοῦ was regarded by Nonnus as in the masculine, and so also by Lampe; de Wette, Bengel, and the Berlenb. Bib. translate—They murmured *concerning Him.* This appears to us correct, and seems to suit well the reduplicated οὗτος afterwards, though the περὶ τούτου of ver. 61 makes us hesitate.

Vers. 43, 44. The Lord does not answer *this* πῶς by any such explanatory response as would be appropriate only to an existing faith; He no more enters into the mystery of His descent from heaven now, than He had before solved the mystery of His coming over the water from the other side. Could we suppose Him to have surrendered up to such minds His great truth, and said—Ye err, beloved people, I was conceived in the womb of Mary my mother, through the power of the Holy Ghost!?—No, His wisdom knoweth better how to speak to unbelievers so as at once to indicate His own dignity, and administer instruction to them. First of all, He endeavours to mitigate their murmuring by the μὴ γογγύζετε which exhorts them to a reflecting tranquillity; for no man is ever drawn of the Father to Him in such a murmuring frame of mind. He then repeats with a more definite development—first, the last great thought which had been uttered, vers. 37–40, and then from ver. 48 onwards, His earlier assertion concerning Himself as the true bread from heaven in vers. 32–35.

For the giving of the Father He now, penetrating deeper, substitutes a *drawing;* an expression which is as profound in its grasp as it is simple to be understood, but which has no strict parallel in earlier phraseology. Meyer explains the word much too superficially, when with a laudable intention to make it plain he says, "like a father drawing or leading his child to the physician or the teacher." That would be "adducere," as Tertullian renders it (adv. Praxeam), or the ὁδηγεῖν of Chrysost. (which he on another occasion exchanges for the flat and yet more

Saviour as the only-begotten and as the archetype, there emanates an especial authority and credit for the original Christian narratives which directly affirm His miraculous conception."

vague *βοήθεια*); but *ἑλκύειν* expresses something more inwardly operative, as ver. 45 presently shows. We may compare in the Old Testament Cant. i. 4, מָשְׁכֵנִי, Hos. xi. 3–5, אֶמְשְׁכֵם, Jer. xxxi. 3, where the LXX. have *εἵλκυσά σε*, although in this ordinarily cited passage such an exposition of the Hebrew text is uncertain.[1] At a further distance comes the later Rabbinical phraseology, which distinguishes those who come voluntarily, from an internal impulse, as *tractos*, גֵרִים גְּרוּרִים; see Buxt. Lex. sub. גור pag. 484, where we find the false interpretation *scil. a se ipsis;* rather should it be, drawn by God Himself, Abodah Sarah 24, 1. (Comp. also Winer Realwörterb. sub. voce Proselyten.) Yet these may serve in some degree for the explanation of the obvious expression. The Father draweth to the Son:—this is *now* said especially for Israel concerning the Old Testament *παιδαγωγία εἰς Χριστόν*; even as afterwards the exalted Son Himself draweth all men in all the world, even the Greeks and Heathens, to Himself, ch. xii. 32.[2] Yet may we not, in relation to this drawing of the *Father* (the analogy of which, indeed, may be traced outside Israel), say with Ebrard, "by means of the *law* through the Holy Spirit;"—but it is the essential Fatherly attraction of love which is meant, the attraction and invitation of mercy *under* all discipline and preparation, for which sense Hos. xi. and Jer. xxxi. are pertinently to be quoted.[3] Indeed, *this* idea of the משך in relation to the proselytes is attested and confirmed by the place in Maimonides

[1] We doubt, however, whether absolutely false, as Baumgarten-Crusius thinks. Gesenius without further ado ranks this מְשַׁכְתִּיךָ חֶסֶד under the formula משך חסד, so that the suffix would be resolved into tibi. Thus R. D. Kimchi expounds—מָשַׁכְתִּי לְךָ חַסְדִּי; the Chald., however, has with equal propriety of grammatical form בְּמַשְׁכָּנָן, בְּרַחֲמֵי יַתְכֹּן, which is just parallel with Hos. xi.—and we must leave the matter undecided.

[2] There is a certain drawing of the Father to the Son, even in the case of the heathen world, and natural humanity; yet ever to be regarded as only the work of *grace*. To use this expression with regard to the longings and susceptibilities yet inherent in our fallen nature (as Beck does, Stud. u. Krit. 1847, 2, 355), is unjustifiable to our mind.

[3] In His state of abasement, the Son doth not yet say—*I draw*, because He hath not yet the full authority for that, being ever in subordination to the Father in this. Hence should we poor mortals arrogate to ourselves nothing before the God-man, but deal kindly with all who are coming. See Meyer Bl. für höhere Wahrheit, V. 382.

adduced by Lampe, in which the teachers are said to deal mildly at first and only to *draw*—וּדְבָרִי רָצוֹן וְרַכִּים.

This much is certain, without any learned investigation, and it is to our experience as manifest as it is mysterious, according to the Lord's testimony—"that if a man longs after God, it comes not from himself, but is the Father's drawing in Jesus Christ His Son." (Jacob Bœhme.) The *awakening* of this longing to draw nigh is not in its deepest principle so much the effect of the terrors of the law, as of the distant influence of eternal love working in them: these are the cords and bands by which God seizeth upon men and bringeth them to Himself. Luther's words, quoted by so many expositors, "the drawing is not like that of the executioner, who draws the thief up the ladder to the gallows; but it is a gracious allurement, such as that of the man whom everybody loves, and to whom everybody willingly goes," may be supplemented by the equally quaint language of the Berlenb. Bibel: "He draweth not as a man draweth to the block!"

Ver. 45. As the Jews had previously brought forward a γεγραμμένον for their manna, so now does the Lord, though late, yet not without reference thereto, bring forward a similar one for that drawing of the Father to which He had alluded, from the Prophets. The general ἐν τοῖς προφήταις might indeed be taken for the customary form of citation, as in Acts xiii. 40, vii. 42; Mark i. 2; or, on the other hand, it may refer to that most pertinent classical passage Isa. liv. 13 in connection with others related to it (such as Jer. xxxi. 33, 34, to which even Schleiermacher would specially refer it); but we think also, that the Lord significantly thus spoke because He would collate, as it were, and place in juxtaposition the promissory part of the Old Testament in the *prophets* with *Moses* of whom mention had been already made. (Fikenscher, with regard to this, has the original remark, that "in the second portion of the Old Testament, which treats of the Divine Promise, God hath revealed His merciful will towards those who seek salvation, and who have already given heed to the voice of the *Law*.")

This drawing, as it is altogether Divine on the part of Him who draweth, so it is "altogether spiritual on the part of him who is drawn" (v. Meyer). It is an inward teaching of God—

an *inward* teaching, consequently not merely that preparation and external guidance which comes through the outward call to the fellowship of His people, and the possession of His word; a *teaching*, consequently it does not consist simply in dim feelings of dependence and superficial conviction, but in *knowledge*. It is deserving of thoughtful remark that our Lord, for His own secret consolation as He stands confronting unbelieving Israel, selects the words appropriate to the present occasion from that prophetic chapter which, following the description of the Messiah's passion and rejection, comforts Him with a glorious prospect of the great congregation of many children which should be born to His church in the last times:—let the fifty-third and fifty-fourth chapters of Isaiah be read in their contrasting connection! But that which there appears as the goal of consummation, is interpreted now, with strict propriety as on the part of God, concerning the deep-laid beginnings from which that consummation is to grow.[1] The free application of those words on the present occasion dispenses with the בָּנַיִךְ which in Isa. liv. 13 suited the connection, but retains the *πάντες* in a *yet more universal* sense. *Διδακτοὶ θεοῦ*, as the Sept. also interprets these (comp. *θεοδίδακτοι*, 1 Thess. iv. 9), corresponds with the Heb. לִמּוּדֵי יְהוָה which signifies these *well-taught* scholars, furnished with perfect knowledge; yet at the same time points to the *way* which leads to that result, the way of obedient hearing and willingness to be taught, see Isa. l. 4, 5. Now, since God hath from the beginning aimed at winning such לִמּוּדִים, and since the more proper fulfilment of that prophecy, the preparing of a new church in Christ, *beginneth* more specifically in the time of Christ, the Lord may well give the words such an application as He here does—affording us a most instructive example of His method of using Scripture, which brings into prominence its most internal and spiritual meaning, that which is of universal force, and passing by its more particular reference. The *docti a Deo* of Erasmus is more correct than the *docibiles Dei* of the Vulg.; yet this latter unusual expression brings out the presupposition which lies in *διδακτοί* of that

[1] "The subject here is the Divine voice in man, preceding faith, to lead them to faith in Christ as a Saviour." Neander.

voluntary learning and hearing which the Lord proceeds to develop and enforce. This ἀκούειν καὶ μανθάνειν (the learning being ever essential and practical, or an *experience*) is the complete explanation of διδάσκεσθαι. Be only a *docibilis Dei*, and thou wilt assuredly come to be a *doctus a Deo!*[1]

We may further take the πάντες which the Lord makes so prominent, in the sense of v. Meyer's note—"and the promise is truly universal, so that no man can excuse himself." Münchmeyer's animadversion (upon the first edition) is, however, so far right as, neither in the prophetic passage, nor in the connection of our Saviour's discourse, is the absolute universality of this call and teaching the immediate subject; but neither can the *all* (as he insists) be interpreted with the predestinarian tinge as *merely*—"all, who actually *will become* His disciples." For *those who hear* and *those who learn* are manifestly in this case a narrower circle—*Not* all whom the Father teacheth accept His teaching. And thus as the Son, according to chap. xii. 32, draweth all men; so certainly doth the Father also, indeed, draw every man in his time, with manifold degrees and in various manners. Thus, consequently, the universal promise remains as an intimated fact, on account of which the Lord adduces the quotation with an extended application. It is not promised that all will learn and accept the teaching; and hence it remains certain, since immediately afterwards the matter is made to rest with *our acceptance* of it, that "*this* passage should abolish all predestinarian meaning in the previous ἑλκύεσθαι." The commencement—The Father draweth; the middle-point of calling and separation—Man yields to be drawn, heareth and learneth; the end of this economy of the Father—He who is drawn *cometh unto Christ.* This coming presupposes indeed a drawing of the Father, but also the hearing and learning. And it is the Lord's design to say that it is this latter which is in the decision of man; and therefore He exhorts them to come, and therefore He dissuades them from an unbelieving holding back. Were it generally otherwise, how *could* then the Lord

[1] Pfenninger's conceit is very pleasant (in the jüdischen Briefen, etc.) of the little boy who comes in among the murmurers against the Lord; and, hearing how beautifully He taught, hoped when he grew older to understand it all, and himself to receive the bread of eternal life.

always and everywhere cry—Come ye, hear, learn of Me! and that in the midst of such men as these Jews? And if the Father doth actually on His part draw and teach *all* these Jews, of whom so few actually became לִמּוּדֵי יְהוָה—how should He not generally draw *all men*?[1]

Vers. 46, 47. And now a further explanation follows, in order to obviate any misunderstanding as to a separation between the Father and the Son; and in order that all who might attain to see the manifested Son may nevertheless be referred immediately to the Father as well; this leading back in ver. 47 to the first and fundamental assertion of vers. 35 and 40. Understand Me not, says the Lord, as if *any man* could ever have heard and seen the Father, unless it were through the mediation of Me, the Son; and that having thus the Father he cometh to Me as to another! Here again are the same trinitarian fundamental-ideas, which are only found fault with by the dogged misapprehension of speculation which goes beyond the word of Scripture, but which as profoundly as clearly pervade the entire Gospel of St John. Here have we also proof, as testified by the universal τίς, that we rightly expounded ch. v. 37 as declaring that no man hath ever immediately seen the Father, in the sense in which the Son alone hath seen Him. (Not even Moses, as Cyril remarks.) The *seeing* is used interchangeably for the hearing, because it is the more internal idea; and it is here substituted because in the same sense no man hath ever heard the Father, or learned anything from Him, independently of the Son who is the mediator of all Revelation. (Matt. xi. 27.)

Vers. 48–51. As we have already said, the Lord *repeats*, in order to cast down all their murmuring by His mild benignity, His first great assertion—I am the bread of life; as the foundation upon which He will then proceed (in the middle, ver. 51, καὶ ὁ ἄρτος κ. τ. λ.) to append another great word, as to the time and manner in which He will feed the world with Himself,

[1] My critic Münchmeyer in his animadversions has not entered into the depth of the connection of thought as pointed at here (and which in the first edition was only briefly hinted at for ready minds). And this is an example, that the diffuseness of which many complain is yet very necessary for many of my readers.

give Himself to the world. Not My word, not My doctrine, not anything of Mine, but I Myself *am* that bread, in My heaven-originated humanity (begotten of the Holy Ghost) which hath in it the Life of God—nothing but this. *Your* fathers—not as the Apostles afterwards say—*our* fathers, in common; the Lord could not possibly have said this latter, though in His human nature descended from those same fathers. There is at the same time a reproving allusion in the word—Your unbelieving fathers, whose genuine children, alas, ye approve yourselves to be. (Matt. xxiii. 31, 32.) They did eat the manna *in the wilderness*, as it is written in Ex. xvi. 32, and ye yourselves have said; though without reflecting that that never brought them *out of* the wilderness. *And are dead*—this has a simple and gentle tone, but in the Lord's lips it means much more than when said by the Jews themselves, ch. viii. 52, 53. Throughout the entire discourse He never speaks *merely* of bodily death, which indeed none of His own were exempted from, and not even Himself. He reminds them that those fathers, not entering the promised land, died *in the wilderness* and *in their sins!* (Ch. viii. 24; 1 Cor. x. 3–5.) The manna saved them not from that—see on the same Ps. lxxviii., to which the Jews had appealed, especially vers. 31, 33. Again, since bodily death is at the same time included in this ἀπέθανον, it follows in vers. 50, 51 that the removal of that too is promised through the ἀνάστασις. Οὗτός ἐστιν, ver. 50, is *now* fully one with the ἐγώ εἰμι, which precedes and follows it; and thus responds to that οὗτος of the murmurers, ver. 42. Ὁ ἄρτος ὁ ζῶν is afterwards explained, ver. 57, in its profoundest meaning; here however it has the direct meaning—I Myself am the living bread, that is, *a living, personal* bread, a living (in the life of God) and life-imparting *Man*, who may therefore truly be called such. *This* is the proper and essential transition to the great statement which now follows.

Ver. 51. Thrice had it been said—I *am* Myself the bread! and now is it added, with a change,—The bread that I will *give*? Obviously, for how could He be the bread, if He could not give Himself, or something of Himself, to eat? Therefore He now distinguishes, from Himself who is the bread, *the bread which He will give*. And what should we expect to find here? First, He

saith—I give; then—I am Myself bread; now if He *again* proceeds to speak of giving, what but Himself can He give? Again, however, because indeed His spiritual person, His most essential I and self, may not be eaten immediately and directly, the solution of the great mystery how a living Man may become bread for other men requires *a means and prepared vessel* which shall be the more definite channel of this most wonderful impartation.[1] Just as He stood in the presence of these Jews at Capernaum, He could not give Himself to them to eat—and yet He has hitherto preserved a careful *distinction* of ideas, between the hearing of His word, the believing on Him, and the eating and drinking of His food. An exposition which should be perfectly unprejudiced and simple-minded, and which received these clear words (containing purely human ideas, whose reference to His Person is the only *θαυμαστόν* in them) as hearers and readers from the time they were spoken till now must have been almost universally compelled to receive them—such an exposition would now wait for something distinctive to follow, and not that blank tautology, insufferable at this critical point in the discourse, which would be involved in the interpretation—And the bread, that is, which I will give, is no other than My Person and Manifestation, once more Myself!

But what other than this insufferable tautology is involved in the far-famed and much-loved exposition of the spiritualists who recoil here from the *flesh* of Jesus, an exposition which first started from the ever-critical gnosis of the Alexandrians?[2] "The bread is the entire living manifestation of the Logos in the flesh, consecrated to the salvation of the world"—may seem to be something different and more to the point, but is not in reality so; for, the Lord's Ἐγώ had already signified no other than His Divine-human Personality and Presence, consequently all that

[1] Kahnis: "A life to be communicated requires a medium of communication. Bread is for others only when, to use the Scripture expression, it is broken for them. Thus He who *is* bread, must *give* bread."

[2] For, what Ignatius, with a free and wide spiritual application, said of the words "flesh and blood of Christ," which are, indeed, *also* symbolical (Dorner, Entwicklungsgeschichte i. 159), can scarcely be called exegesis; it was not intended to be so, and indeed latently recognised the real sense.

is contained in His manifestation in the flesh.[1] This is very obviously seen in Ebrard's remark—"the totality of the Person of Christ, the whole Christ, is to be to us what bread is to the body!" For we may put another question—How may this be? How does the *giving* enter into this? and if we are referred to the "believing" which, in us and because we believe His plain word, desires still the promised eating, this is only to lead us round and round the pastureless and unsatisfying heath of speculation, and to despatch us with a vague *Crede et manducasti* in a very different sense from that which St Augustine could have intended. Regarding the Lord's words in their integrity from beginning to end, and contemplating the mass of such emptying and enfeebling exposition, in which the plain words which He speaks are turned into mere figures revolving round a nebulous nothing, we are compelled to exclaim—This is a hard *exegesis*, who can hear it?[2]

For, ἡ σάρξ μου is not—My person, My power and influence, My spirit, yea not even My body, but absolutely no other than what it says—My *flesh*. Further, the ἐστίν in connection with it is *explanatory;* it forms the *transition* from the *figurative* expression ἄρτος to the expression *proper;* just as we find it said in the parable—The enemy *is* the Devil; or, The harvest *is* the end of the world. The Lord never explained—any more than any reasonable man among ourselves—a figurative saying by a new

[1] Klee's aim is good, but he hits it unskilfully, when he says—"From this purely spiritual and ideal eating and reception of Him, He now passes to another eating and reception, to the true and actual reception of His body in us." For this is not *another* eating distinguished from the former, nor had the Lord been speaking of a purely spiritual and ideal eating at all, neither the Saviour nor the Scripture generally knows anything of this.

[2] Petersen (v. d. Kirche i. 171), that the Lord is the bread of life "because He as absolute religion in Person is for humanity its true substance" (comp. S. 219), and this is not badly said, but this spiritual internalising must not take away the reality of the "bread" which is the "flesh"—this Petersen would not do. (Comp. S. 222.) Here let Thiersch speak—"The necessity of recognising a mystery in the Lord's Supper has become apparent to many of our recent theologians from a clear apprehension of the Lord's words in St John: all attempts to establish an unreal and spiritualist explanation must be wrecked upon this discourse." (Vorlesungen über Kath. u. Prot. 2 Aufl. ii. 252.)

figure. Let the whole discourse, moreover, be examined in its progression :—first, the general βρῶσις derived from the occasion ; then the ἄρτος which already promises a real, concrete signification ; now that interpretation in σάρξ ; and finally the most concrete and material σάρξ καὶ αἷμα. So that there is not here, as Schulz animadverts, a sudden and unexpected leap in the sense ; but only the express mention of that which had been perfectly prepared for, and intended throughout.

We leave Scheibel's altogether over-curious investigations as to the presence or absence of the article in σάρξ[1] to rest upon their own foundation ; they are not necessarily involved in the establishment of the assured truth, that the flesh of *Jesus* is, through the sanctity of His birth and of His being, with all its ὁμοίωμα in relation to our own, essentially distinguished from it. We certainly have afterwards ἡ σάρξ simply (as in ver. 63), but when the Lord says now—ἡ σάρξ μου, it must be understood in the sense of that corporeity united with sinless holiness, thoroughly penetrated and filled with Divine life, which is to be conceived of in the ὁ λόγος σάρξ ἐγένετο of the Prologue. Thus it is actually a "special human nature which the Lord here ascribes to Himself, and promises for man's sustenance."[2] He does *not* say—I will give My *spirit* to be your bread of life ; but it is as afterwards explained in ver. 63—*My* flesh *is* spirit and life. He does not, however, say as yet σῶμά μου, as afterwards at the supper ; for, that His flesh, as it was before death, was to become a body extended into innumerable members in the church, was only to be mediated and accomplished through His death and resurrection ; He here means simply and clearly that human corporeity, in which He stood before His hearers, pointing at the same time to a future giving of His body, or its preparation for being made the bread of the world.

It is acknowledged by most expositors that ἣν ἐγὼ δώσω[3] speaks

[1] The venerable old Glassius admitted : dubia et infirma sæpe esse, quæ ex *articulorum* emphasi desumuntur argumenta pro *articulis fidei* comprobandis. And : ex curiosâ et minus necessariâ articuli consideratione falsæ hypotheses et errores facile oriri et invehi possunt.

[2] Scheibel in his larger work on the Lord's Supper, p. 201.

[3] Although this clause is wanting in the Vulg. and other Vers. and Codd.,

of *death* and nothing else. Even Hezel could not regard it otherwise, though he trifles upon it: "His death was the slaying of an animal body; animals are slaughtered for food, hence the occasion for the *figure*. It is not to our taste. But it is truly oriental!" He then comes back from the historical and actual slaughter of the paschal lamb to the oriental figure in our paschal supper, and then with truly occidental abstraction interprets—"He who eateth My *body*, that is, tasteth and relisheth, doth not misunderstand, My whole life-history, with all and each of its events, even the most paradoxical, *regarding them from the right point of view*;—he to whom the whole series of my fates upon earth is matter of delight and nourishment." No, such exegesis as this has no relish for us even as such; far less has the food which it thus offers the nourishment which our hearts, hungry for life, longing for spiritual life and refreshment, cry out for. But we ask once more—Is that which our spiritualists offer us in their prejudiced exegesis essentially different, in its ground, from the poor theory of the savourless Hezel? Can then "the manifestation of Christ as the Son of man in flesh and blood" be matter of nourishment to our souls without anything further; and better and more essentially so *after His death* than before, in spite of our absolute conviction that the contrary must be the case?

Schleiermacher, indeed, tells us that "the Divine and heavenly in the Redeemer could not otherwise be communicated to us than through His having taken flesh and blood and become Man; in His human life and influence and doctrine we must discern the Divine and *receive it into ourselves*." But that goes no further than the incarnation, and does not include the mystery of its consummation in the death of the cross; if the Lord had spoken of *that*, and if that had been enough, He would have said—My flesh, which I have assumed, instead of—My flesh, which I will

and is rejected by Lachmann and Tischendorf, yet it is undoubtedly genuine. Lücke admits that it must be supplied from the first δώσω which is undisputed, but the short formula appears to us altogether inharmonious and strange. Neander, too, regards it as very harsh and unlike John's phraseology, and says very properly that its omission would be occasioned by the ὃν ἐγὼ δώσω immediately preceding. Even de Wette perceives that the excluded words are indispensable to the sense.

give. And Schulz is complacent enough to add—"to eat His flesh and drink His blood, means to make ourselves participants of His blessed manifestations as the Son of man with flesh and blood, *and* of the benefit of His sacrifice of His own life." But in our text there is no room for this *and*, the latter alone is the thing in point. The question now involved is the communication itself; and, in using σάρξ in relation to it, the Lord can evidently not mean simply the acceptance of the benefit of His death. For *He does not speak of a* πιστεύειν in the δοῦναι, but of the φαγεῖν of that σάρξ which is given, and which only in and after His death approves itself to be in the fullest sense living and life-giving; and further, He so speaks as to show that He is explaining the previous figure by language which is now unfigurative. "Thus the flesh now *becomes* bread. The flesh has to do with the obtaining for us, the bread with our enjoyment and appropriation." (Berlen. Bib.) Lücke is partly right when he says that "the giving up of His flesh is the condition and appointed manner of the true and full enjoyment of Christ." For the promised *giving* embraces in one word two ideas—He will so give it to death, that it may afterwards be given for the life of the world. But yet it is only half-true, for there is a fundamental point which cannot be reasoned away, which men's blinded eyes and pusillanimous faith shrink from in dread, plainly as it is written down, viz.—that this sacrificed *flesh* is itself the only and true *object* of participation. Life is given to us through His appropriated death, and the vehicle of that gift is ἀληθῶς His σάρξ καὶ αἷμα, become for us πνεῦμα καὶ ζωή.

There, as He stood before the eyes of the people, of the disciples, of the Apostles, He had the words of eternal life, as the best among them felt even though they understood it not; He performed the works of Divine Omnipotence; but with all His works and words, with all the believing of those who believed in Him He came not yet into their souls, so that even the Apostles could only avow, standing as yet without, and as it were over against Him,—*Thou hast* words of eternal life! These words could not yet become to them the bread of life, any more than we now can receive, *merely* through the word, as only *word*, that same life which is the implanted germ of the resurrection at the last day. But after He had given up His flesh to death, He

received it again glorified and Spirit-penetrated, and in this He giveth us life. The excellent Lange, who, alas, has fallen into the toils of the spiritualism of our perilous time, speaks in a very strange way for a Christian man—"The world as a whole eats, absorbs, Christ; draws Him into its life of death; but *thereby* His life-giving flesh, identical with spirit, His energising quickening being, is communicated to the world, and gives it back its life." Not so! Not a single word is here said of the world's receiving Christ into itself; and, to a Christian apprehension of what the world is and what Christ is, this is a horrendum dictu. Hence it is only—ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου ζωῆς, not—εἰς ζωήν. Vers. 53–58 speak of *him who* truly eateth Christ, and is nourished by Him.[1]

It is as if the contention of the Jews, ver. 52, stood in the gospel as a prelude and type of the warfare of commentators over this discourse. Their endless variety of interpretations betrays the same confusion. Yet it is with pain we must confess that the Jews better apprehended the subject of the problem than our volatilising expositors. That which the whole company of these worse Nicodemuses contend about with their πῶς δύναται is the incontestable and plain δοῦναι τὴν σάρκα.[2] They add their φαγεῖν, and with a right apprehension; for, the Lord immediately confirms and takes it up—ἐὰν μὴ φάγητε.[3] He makes no

[1] Lange's answer to my observations (Leben Jesu iii. 613) does not induce me, unprejudiced as I am and full of respect for him, to retract them. He appeals to the fact that, according to ver. 33, life is given to the world (?), but this must be very cautiously understood, for the ὑπέρ of ver. 51 brings in the appropriate interpretation of ver. 33; and in no case, we must maintain it, does the world as a whole absorb and consume Christ. This is an expression which, as being altogether improper and misleading, I must denounce.

[2] The objectors characteristically omit the αὐτοῦ (which is only introduced as a false reading), since they think not of the specific difference of *His* flesh.

[3] "The Jews thought that Jesus spoke of an actual partaking of His body, and Jesus does not give them to understand by a single syllable that they thought wrong: He maintains and repeats it. He makes mention also of His blood, so that we can all the less doubt that He intended to be understood in the literal sense." (Klee.) Consequently in no such sense as that which Ebrard understands (i. 79), who thinks "the Lord by a kind of *oxymoron* entered into the very words of the op-

reply to the πῶς, and therefore we should not seek one; certainly should we not *contend*, with imaginations of our own replying to the πῶς over the mystery of our eating unto eternal life. But the more we contend, the more plainly and stringently does He assure us that He means no other than what He has literally said, and what He goes on still more literally to say. Are we then to eat the flesh of man? was the question of a Capernaitical misunderstanding, which overlooked the future tense of the saying, and all that might be involved in that. Has then Christ even still His flesh for us to eat? This is the question and contention of our *Christians* now, notwithstanding that He has instituted for them the last *Supper*. Here stands His answer for a testimony—He who believeth, and cometh and eateth, in and out of the Sacrament, will become inwardly conscious of its truth. Dost thou as a Christian assume its truth, but without being able with entire and absolute simplicity to bow before the word; dost thou, with a pure intention to make it more intelligible and apprehensible, seek to remove as much as possible what is offensive to thy reason in the σάρξ (as *many* must have done then, else would there have been a much more general and unanimous murmuring)—then be sure that the Lord is patient with thee, and will continue to utter His plain word until thou dost understand it, or until, even with a lack of perfect apprehension, thou dost experience its inmost truth in spite of thy under-

ponents, and assured them that He certainly would give them His flesh to *eat*, that is, in a spiritual sense," or, in other words, *not* actually His *flesh!* Nor as de Wette conceives, who regards the carnal language of the Jews as being taken up and intensified by Him "through a *love of paradox* peculiar to Him in St John!" All such shifts and turns deal falsely with the text and *pervert the meaning of Jesus*, to use the mildest words. Even Schulthess, who on his own authority has struck out the second clause of ver. 51 as foreign to John's style and inconceivable (and, in order to undermine the whole effectually, with equal arbitrariness declared the words ἣν—δώσει down to ὁ θεός to be *patched in*)—this same Schulthess admits that "if Jesus actually said all that is *here written*, it was no chicanery on the part of the Jews, but they took the words *in the only sense which they could bear*, even if there were another meaning in them." What need have we of further witnesses? For that a Schulthess should strike out what did not suit him is just as marvellous as that the Jews should only in *chicanery deduce from* ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ἄρτος their δοῦναι τὴν σάρκα φαγεῖν! ("Is it food, so must He give Himself to feed. And what else is there in Him to *eat* but His *flesh?*")

standing. *For*, the contention about it is better than the murmuring; though there are cases in which murmuring and contradiction might be better, because more sincere, than disputation out of a murmuring heart.

Ver. 53. Their unintelligent striving, with which indeed much murmuring may have been mixed up, enforces from the Lord His final affirmation; in which He pursues His testimony to the utmost bounds of what He could reveal to them, though retaining throughout the form of testimony still. His sacred dignity does not permit Him here to enter so far into the *συζήτησις* as He afterwards in His condescension did (as this Gospel attests);—let us take notice of this distinction, and follow His example. Let us on our part take great care how we give good reasons to those who dispute; yet never overstepping those limits, where mysteries demand only faith, and all *μάχεσθαι* as well as all *γογγύζειν* can do no more than hinder the soul from hearing and learning the Father or the Son. Let us not, when we reach that limit, qualify and dilute the interpretation of the Lord's word, in order to make it plausible to human understanding; but imitate the Lord in this history, and give out our exposition as simply a testimony appealing to the *αὐτὸς ἔφα* of *our* Master, which should put an end to every dispute.

He who refuses to eat and to drink, will not live, or will not be able to *maintain* life. Just so, does the Lord now say, ye can have or *obtain*, without that nourishment of which I speak, *no life in yourselves!* Thus speaks He to living men, standing before Him, whom He thus declares to be, according to *their* nature, spiritually dead; and the *ζωὴ ἐν ἑαυτοῖς* is their life in its higher element and power, the internal and real life of the Spirit of God. "By being certified of our utmost danger of death must we be brought unto faith. But this way pleases these inquisitive Jews as little as it pleased their forefathers." (Rieger.) Moreover, it is obvious that our Lord does not in this so rigidly worded utterance deny the beginnings of Divine life in man, before the nourishment of His flesh and blood became possible to them; but He mentions now the *ζωὴν ἔχειν* in that entire fulness of meaning which involves the consummation at the final resurrection; in order to this, He solemnly testifies, the fellowship of His Divine and living corporeity

(glorified in death) is necessary. For certain assurance that He means nothing else than the *life* dwelling in His flesh, and through it communicated to us, not the flesh as flesh, nor yet the πνεῦμα αἰώνιον of His Divinity in itself (Heb. ix. 14), but *that* in union with His human corporeity, He now further connects with it the *blood*, in which is the life. (Lev. xvii. 11.) But what a new offence is this to Jewish ears; since, from the time of Noah, and more expressly after the promulgation of the Levitical law (see again Lev. xvii.), the partaking of the blood was an abomination forbidden under the penalty of entire excison! Thus this is not simply a "strengthening" of the "figure," but a very strong and newly iterated declaration that in and with Himself *an altogether new thing* should come; that He would provide for the world a *Paschal sacrificial meal*, in which the entire old covenant should be surpassed and abolished. At the same time the definite separation and juxtaposition of *flesh* and *blood*[1] speaks in the most significant manner of that *death* of which ver. 51 testified, since only a perfect death entirely separates the flesh and blood.[2] The Peschito uses everywhere here פְּגַר for σάρξ, but this is essentially inexact, since it is not a *cadaver* which is spoken of here; it describes simply the flesh as having passed through death, and been emptied of the blood. The *concomitantia* of the body and blood is not true of the Lord's Supper, any more than of Jesus Himself as gone up into the heavens, as we may learn from Heb. xii. 24.[3]

Thus we find our way to the answer to the last question—How *receive* we and partake of the flesh of Christ given to us through death? And what is this *eating* and *drinking* of which the Lord here at length speaks? *How* it takes place cannot be told independently of experience; and we poor mortals, who

[1] The latter is therefore to be *drunk;* not, as the prohibiting law speaks, to be *eaten* with the flesh.

[2] It is as if it were also said—Which I will *pour out* for the life of the world.

[3] That is, if an express word of Scripture is demanded, and allowed to be valid. Otherwise the severance of the blood from the risen and glorified body is of itself a simple and necessary consequence. "Flesh *and* blood," in the connection which the pervasive circulation effects, is an idea appropriate only to the present mortal condition of corporeity.

with all our philosophy and physiological researches have never penetrated the lower mystery of our earthly nourishment, may perfectly rest in that, if we only know by inward consciousness that we have received life. But *what* is it? It is eating and drinking: who can better state it, or more clearly define it? We repeat that this eating and drinking is *not* one and the same with *believing*. Zwingli's reason may ever so flatly maintain that Christ speaks of a kind of profitable enjoyment of His flesh and blood *in which nothing corporeal finds place*,[1] but he says nothing in his opposition to the Ἀμὴν, Ἀμήν of our Lord, more than that he has not understood it, and indeed has not heard it aright. Of still less account is that dangerous idealising of the plain word, evaporating its meaning, and resolving Christ into the world, which we alas find in the pages of Lange. "When man apprehends *the world* in its *ideality*, in the true relations of its being, and thus in its highest relation, that is, in its relation to Christ, *it will already in a sense become to him the body and blood of Christ*, and there he will enjoy the nourishment for his true life. But more *essentially* he partakes of the body and blood of Christ, when the whole Personality of Jesus, all the acts of His life (even the most paradoxical, *videatur Hezel antea!*), *especially* His death, become to him the pure, spiritually quickening food of his essential nature. *But then finally* he enjoys the body and blood of Christ in a distinctive sense, when the *word* concerning the life and death of Christ becomes to him one with the thus consecrated element of real life-nourishment itself. As long as man partakes not the body and blood of Christ, that is, does not live, move, breathe in the real-ideal relations of the world to Christ and through Christ to God, must his hunger after life (not his *death?*) continue, notwithstanding all earthly nourishment, and his thirst for life remain unassuaged, notwithstanding all earthly cups. It is manifest that Jesus has here depicted in a *symbolical* form the *eternal ideal communion* which begins with the beginning of the Christian's life of faith," etc., etc. No, it is only manifest that

[1] In the celebrated letter to Alber. Vult Christus, nisi carnem ejus edamus, *id est nisi credamus* mortem eum pro nobis obiisse et sanguinem effudisse, vitâ nos carituros. Tunc editur corpus ejus, cum pro nobis creditur cœsum. Fides ergo est, non manducatio, de quâ Christus hic loquitur.

the protest which was lifted up in Krummacher's Palmblättern against Lange's falling away from the *Scriptural* Christ, if not founded on altogether sound principles and misunderstanding much that was true, was yet on the whole correct and necessary, and that Kling's apology (in the Rheinischen Monatschrift) is altogether too complacent. For here we have the κόσμος becoming Christ, not an ἐνσάρκωσις of the λόγος; as if the Lord had said—Unless all your eating and drinking is an eating and drinking of Me; or—As ye have in you the hungering after life, that is, already life itself, so must ye also know and experience that I Myself am everywhere and in all things its appropriate nourishment!! It is quite characteristic that we find here the *body* always substituted for the *flesh*,—a view altogether unwarranted; and equally *perverting* and profaning is that view by which the most holy communion-table of the Lord is changed into a table served at all places and for the whole world, at which in every enjoyment the "eternal ideal communion" is celebrated, with the world opened up to us by Christ and glorified in and by Him.[1] He who shall thoughtfully ponder all this, will perceive in such words the last extreme of that exposition which recoils from the actual flesh and blood of Christ, and will fly back with a far greater abhorrence to the simple letter of the word of Christ.

But we are now pressed by the question which has excited the contention of ages—Does the Lord here speak of the hereafter instituted Supper or not? It is with the utmost modesty that we would oppose high, even the highest authorities, of holy men and ecclesiastical confessions; but we feel ourselves constrained and warranted *once more to stand in opposition*, with all the earnest emphasis of a conviction which has never stood altogether alone in the true church of all ages. The fathers of the church began very early to spiritualise the meaning here; Luther and Calvin were at one in this, that the discourse did

[1] Literally we find in Lange afterwards: "The entrance into the *Christological world*, in which *all* sensual experience becomes an enjoyment of the body and blood of Christ." Once more—"All gratification of life becomes a happy consciousness of incarnate being!!" This would have a more appropriate place in Leop. Schefer's Laienbrevier. Even though the Cathari had said it before, whom Rothe (Ethik ii. 463) justifies.

not treat of the sacrament; the Formula Concordiæ makes it a testing article that John vi. only meant a *spiritualis* manducatio;[1] Storr "willingly concedes that John vi. says nothing of the sacramental ordinance; and in general most were agreed in this, till these later days when opinion has begun to turn. Lücke quietly says, that "the historical relations of the discourse, as well as the entire connection and expression of the thoughts, forbid *every* reference to the Supper, whether mediate or immediate"—and certainly this is saying too much. Baumgarten-Crusius, the same: "There can be no doubt left upon the point, that this discourse contains no allusion to the Eucharist." Lange, after his manner, says: "This discourse cannot speak specifically of the Lord's Supper, because it is treating of the entire christological relation of the world, *out of which* Christ at His death deduced and made prominent the institution of the sacrament (which in symbolical precision represents that great full truth, and typifies the ideal participation of His life). Or the sacrament is only spoken of in a similar way to that in which *the institution of Baptism may be referred to in the history of the flood!!*" This is a melancholy corroboration of what Dav. Schulz so presumptuously says—"John thinks of the Supper in its right place"—which, in the case of St John, can scarcely be thought of a priori!

On the other side Lampe is obliged to confess: *Negari nequit, Patrum maximum numerum* nostrum locum de sacramentali manducatione intellexisse. As Roman Catholics have been here and there found to deny it in opposition to their church, so also have there even been Lutherans earnest in acknowledging and maintaining the reference of this chapter to the sacrament.[2] Bengel, with whom we almost entirely agree, declares himself in very measured terms: "Jesus framed His words so skilfully,

[1] Duplex igitur est manducatio carnis Christi. Una spiritualis, de quâ *præcipue* Christus in Evangelista Johanne capite sexto agit, quæ non alio modo, quam spiritu et fide in *prædicatione et meditatione Evangelii* fit. Ed. Rechenb. pag. 743. Though one might find refuge here in some qualifying and better interpretation forced upon the *præcipue*.

[2] Calvin. Instit. iv. 17, 4. Nam quod se panem vitæ nuncupavit, non eam a sacramento sumpsit appellationem, *ut quidam perverse interpretantur*. These *quidam* are probably Lutherans, even at that time.

that immediately at the time, and at all times subsequently, they would indeed apply in their strict literal sense to the spiritual enjoyment of Himself; and yet that afterwards the same words should by consequence be appropriate to express the most august mystery of the Holy Supper when that should be instituted. For, *He applied to the Holy Supper the thing itself which is set forth in this discourse.*" The arch-Lutheran Scheibel does not hold in this matter with father Luther (which in his work he discreetly passes over), and must stand as a heretic before the Formula Concordiæ. He is not ashamed, in company with Knapp, to appeal to such men as Bretschneider (Probabilia S. 86–90), and Schott (Epit. theol. dogm. Ed. 2. p. 142), as unprejudiced witnesses for the application to the Eucharist. In the Lutheran Zeitschrift (1847, 4) Oster, among others, has maintained the truth against Luther and almost all Lutherans, though with many strange things mixed up with his defence. Even the recent work of Kahnis is unprejudiced enough, at least in general, to admit what will not bear denial.[1] And Calvin, we may add, could not avoid commencing the chapter to which we have already alluded with the admission of some kind of reference—Ecclesiæ suæ sacramentum dedit, Spirituale epulum scilicet, *ubi* se Christus vivificum esse panem testatur.[2]

How is it then? And what must we say to a simple Christian who involuntarily thinks, when he reads this chapter, of the Lord's Supper, in order to bring to bear upon him the opposition of theological wisdom; which typus doctrinæ is it that we must select to extract and remove the embodying element from this "spiritual participation," out of all the various methods of stating the subject, from those of Clemens Alex. and Origen, down to the "excellent Schulz" or the ingenious and poetic Lange? We think, would we say to him, that there have always been theologians whose wisdom has been one and the same with the simple intelligence of the church. "God's words

[1] See the history of exposition on this subject in a short sketch of Kahnis, p. 115–118.

[2] The Reformed may make as good use of this ubi, as the Lutherans of the præcipue of the Formula Concordiæ. In another place Calvin says, upon John vi.—Nihil hic dicitur, quod non in sacrâ cœnâ figuretur ac vere præstetur fidelibus.

alone throw the true light upon God's works"—this utterance of Hasenkamp is just as true when inverted—God's works also throw the true light upon His words.[1] This twofold canon has a most perfect application to the relation between John vi. and the Institution of the Supper, under two aspects—the Sacrament is to be understood according to this Word, and this Word is to be explained by the Sacrament. When the Lord, being about to give His flesh for the life of the world, appointed His body and blood to be eaten and drunk in the future—must He not have thought of what had been said at Capernaum, and have reminded His disciples of it likewise? Was not this institution a fulfilment of that previous discourse? Were both *without any connection?* We think it impossible to affirm this. And can we suppose that Christ, when He was speaking at Capernaum, did not at all think of the future Sacrament? We regard that as equally impossible and unimaginable. Bengel: "And of so great moment is this sacrament, that it may readily be thought that Jesus, as He foretold the treachery of Judas at ver. 71, and His own death in this verse, so also foretold, one year before, the institution of the Holy Supper, *concerning which, He most surely thought within Himself whilst speaking these words:* and with this object, in order that the disciples might afterward remember His prediction. The whole of these words concerning His flesh and blood have in view the passion of Jesus Christ, and along with it the Holy Supper. Hence arises the separate mention *of the flesh* and *of the blood* so invariably." Yea, verily, to this also belongs what is said in the sixth verse of the same chapter—He Himself well knew what He would do.

Almost all the lines of opposition to this truth meet in one great misunderstanding, that the Lord is supposed here *only* and *exclusively* to be speaking of the afterwards instituted *sacramental* participation in bread and wine; now this we declare as firmly as any to be entirely untrue, and such an exaggeration of our meaning involves a grave offence in our opponents.[2] We may say at first with entire correctness—The Lord's Supper

[1] As we said before in our Andeutungen für gläub. Schriftverst. S. 83.

[2] As, for example, Baumgarten-Crusius speaks of the view contended against, as if it made Jesus say—He who shall not partake of the Supper to be instituted, etc., etc. But this is far from our meaning!

points back to this discourse as its foundation; and then must also perceive that this discourse points prospectively to the Lord's Supper. The Jews had, like their fathers, miraculous food in the wilderness, but they ate it only as common bread, on account of their unbelief; the Lord anticipatingly grants to our faith the assurance that to us even a morsel of common bread and a few drops of the fruit of the vine shall become His flesh and His blood.

Nothing is more simple than the old observation, that the Evangelist John, who has historically recorded neither the appointment of Baptism nor the institution of the Lord's Supper, has exhibited to us instead, how the Lord in ch. iii. prophetically spoke of the essential nature of Christian Baptism, and here in ch. vi. of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper.[1] Von Gerlach admits this: "As Baptism is the sacrament of regeneration of water and of the Spirit, so the Holy Supper is the Sacrament of this quickening and renewal through the flesh and blood of Christ, and therefore stands in the same relation to this discourse which Baptism does to the conversation with Nicodemus." But this is saying very much and quite enough, for Jesus "speaks, however, in both places (although of spiritual baptism and of the spiritual supper), yet *with reference to their visible instrumentalities*" (v. Meyer on ch. iii. 5). And Delitzsch has lately avowed (Beicht-und Communionbuch S. 32) two positions to be impregnable, that this discourse is not to be taken as figurative, and that it is related to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper just as Jno. iii. 5 is to the institution of Baptism.

Thus, indeed, the Lord is *not merely* here speaking of an external *eating and drinking* exhibited and sealed through a symbol elevated into a Sacrament. "The circumstance that the Lord speaks freely of the participation of His body and of His blood *before* He had instituted the last Supper, shows that bread and wine are not invariably or indispensably necessary in order to eat and

[1] Lücke postulates that St John must afterwards have narrated the institution of the Supper if his readers were to understand this chapter on this supposition; but he forgets entirely that *his readers* already enjoyed the Lord's Supper when they obtained his Gospel! De Wette thinks that St John's not mentioning the institution of the Sacrament makes it *improbable* that He refers to it in ch. vi.;—but the very contrary is true.

to drink Him, or to be born again into a new creature through the impartation of His pervading incarnate nature."[1] Thus the institution of the Sacrament itself is not meant; in which we must, to avoid falling into heathenish superstition, absolutely distinguish between the external and the internal, with all their unity. "The external participation signifies the internal, but, in signifying it, effects it also." (v. Meyer.) Thence follows what he has said elsewhere—"Is then this external participation absolutely necessary to this effect of being united to Christ, so that we become partakers of His glorified humanity? The entire sixth chapter of St John opposes such a notion, as well as the true life which we discern to be enjoyed by people who from erroneous principles reject altogether the external Sacrament, only being the more eager on that account for the internal eating and drinking of Jesus Christ." Else they would have been right who gave the Sacrament to little children that they might not remain utterly without life; but the Lord would not have been right here and in Rev. iii. 20, where He in distinctive contrast with the external speaks of an internal Supper, enjoyed in the heart of the believer opened to His entrance, and using also language derived from the institution of the former.[2] We will now set over against the threefold method of enjoyment which Lange gave us, another threefold method, but thus:—Man has already a preparatory fellowship in the bread of God, not indeed through Christ in the *world*, but by participation in the *body of the church*, in which the energies and influences of Christ are now working; then, consummating this, he becomes personally a partaker of Christ when He receives Him in faith, and through faith by the Holy Ghost (without earthly medium) receives His flesh and blood; finally, the Sacrament is the sealing of this participation in critical and *concentrated* assurance and reality, helping many to its first enjoyment and strengthening all there-

[1] In the admirable questions and answers on the Sacrament, v. Meyer's Blätter f. h. Wahrheit iii. 185. With which we may compare v. 136, x. 129, xi. 224, in order to be fundamentally instructed in all that pertains to the subject, or at least to be stimulated to obtain such instruction.

[2] Thus when Kahnis (v. Abendm. S. 125) says that a reception of the body and blood of our Lord independently of the Sacrament has no other Scripture than this to rest upon, he forgets Rev. iii. 20.

in. For here we may confidently agree with Petrus Martyr, *rightly understood*:—"Nor must we think that there is any difference between the spiritual manducation of John vi. and that which our Lord instituted afterwards in the Holy Supper, save that *a symbol was added* in the Sacrament *to the doctrine and promise* which had before been given."[1]

The Lord, in sum—with the intention of afterwards establishing the great truth in an external Sacrament for our weak faith—speaks here beforehand of the essential, inward *spiritual* Supper, of the essential res sacramenti; so that we have here already "the final leading back of the sacramental participation" to an actually present, essential eating and drinking, to which Melanchthon rather than Luther attached himself. (Nitzsch Urkundenbuch der Union, S. 51.) This epithet "spiritual" (*i.e.* unsacramental), however, which may well be admitted for the sake of the above contrast, we must not understand of a *spiritualis* fruitio or manducatio in the strictest sense as opposed to corporeity, since *other than in* the Sacrament there yet remains the actual σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα which we receive; consequently there is an eating and drinking which the mouth of the inner man effects. What other than this might be "the *idea* of the Supper"—which many admit here? *Consequently the words of institution are to be understood according to Jno. vi.;* and as Luther rejects this because his exaggerated doctrine of the eating and drinking even of unbelievers is overturned on this view by the whole of the passage, vers. 54–57, we have only on that very account to protest all the more strongly, with the Lord's plain word in our favour, against Luther's doctrine.[2] Not as the Magdeburgers in their dispute reversed it, and would explain the obscure words in St John by the plain words of institution![3] In such a dilemma is found the whole sacramental dispute. But

[1] Plank, Geschichte des protest. Lehrbegriffs v. 2, 18.

[2] Yea assuredly "every man who received the body and blood of Christ, *would*, according to Christ's words, receive eternal life"—consequently the unworthy cannot receive His body and blood. Kahnis in vain endeavours to invalidate this consequence by His obscure words about *the idea of the Supper*, and thus about what the Supper was supposed to effect. (S. 124.)

[3] Plank, Geschichte des Lehrbegriffs, S. 94.

we on the other side hold fast to this, that the discourse of Christ here is to be applied to the Sacrament; and against the interpretation which would forbid that we protest, as against one which invalidates and destroys its essential spirit and meaning. "Is it possible," cries Nitzsch (Urkundenb. S. 57) with incontrovertible force, "for a man so *superficially* to explain flesh and blood in John vi. as Luther does, and then to understand body and blood so profoundly as He does, when He interprets the Sacrament!"

Let us ask, finally, and returning from our own time and its contentions to the Jews who were then listening, whether these latter would not be likely to think of something akin to what afterwards was made prominent in the Lord's Supper. Pfenninger's declaration that "neither Jew nor Gentile could have understood *that!*" is altogether incorrect as far at least as the Jews are concerned. They could as Jews better understand the real eating and drinking of a *sacrificed* flesh and blood than they could have understood the ideal partaking of our speculatists; that is, if they had not been blinded by their offence against His human person. The δώσω ὑπὲρ spoke in well-known terms of a sin-offering and atonement, as which the Lord would offer Himself. But their contradicting and prejudiced will causes them to pass over that; and, instead of sympathizing with the eating of that flesh as bread, which the connecting middle-term of the *sacrificial meal* should have rendered easy, they precipitately take offence at the simple δοῦναι τὴν σάρκα φαγεῖν. Kling (Stud. u. Krit. 1836, i. 147) has very pertinently referred to the passover-season, ver. 4, though without specifically enough deducing the consequence,[1] that at such a time the reference to the Paschal Lamb must have been very obvious as well to those who were *hearing* as to Him who spake. Moreover, we find again in chap. vii. 37 just such a point of connection for the discourse in the *thoughts appropriate to the feast.* And we heartily agree with Kling (idem S. 148) when he replies to the sophistical question—"How could Jesus propose such a subject in this place and to such hearers?" by the counter-question—"How could St John presume to place his own thoughts, however conformable to truth, in

[1] As Lindner does (Lehre v. Abendm. S. 42), and Knapp previously (Glaubenslehre ii. 476).

his Lord's lips?" We say with him from our very heart—If the Evangelist has so arranged the discourses of Jesus in inappropriate situations without historical truth, "then his Gospel becomes a mere romance (Poetry and Truth out of the life of Jesus, inextricably interwoven), and it loses that character of μαρτυρία which its author so expressly vindicates for it."

Ver. 54. According to Calvin, these words render it indubitably certain that—perperam de cœna exponi totum hunc locum. With this we cannot by any means agree; but, on the other hand, it is indubitably certain to us that an eating of the flesh, and a drinking of the blood of Christ on the part of unbelievers and reprobates, has been corruptly fastened on the manducatio oralis, and introduced improperly into the notion of the Sacrament. Not merely this utterance of our Lord, but the entire New Testament, shows us that an actual participation of the body and blood of our Lord, as not springing from and not leading to faith, is an unimaginable nothing, the assertion of which, however, on the part of the Lutherans, was the cause of all this unhappy strife.

The Lord now in these last five verses leads back His discourse, which has gone so far and so deeply into the plain reality of the subject, to this general commencement concerning the bread of heaven:—I am *bread*, food, nourishment in the fullest and truest sense; man may and must partake of Me, eat and drink Myself (vers. 54–56)—then I give to the eater *life*, that life which I have *from the Father*, ver. 57—consequently this is the true bread *from heaven* which abolishes death, ver. 58. Q. E. D.

Τρώγειν, instead of φαγεῖν, is certainly, even if it introduces no distinction of meaning, yet a strengthening of the expression, as Lange admits (though condemning himself) when he says—"thus truly and properly to eat." On the other hand we are unable to perceive how (as Tholuck thinks) the words τρώγειν and πίνειν, *unless they are tropes*, should prove too much and lead to the Catholic doctrine. For laying aside the actual mastication with the bodily mouth, there is the fervent and eager *reception into ourselves* of the invisible, spiritual-corporeal flesh and blood of Christ, which assuredly is an actual eating and drinking on the part of the essential man which liveth not

by bread alone. Moreover, there cannot be brought forward a single parallel in which our Lord, especially when opposing prejudice and misunderstanding, has so peremptorily and pertinaciously pushed a mere figure to its uttermost extreme. If in the Old Testament the typical character of Solomon's Song (to take the strongest example) delineates and paints out the individualities of the figure, that we must consider as something quite foreign from our present theme, and not to be drawn into analogy with it. For there the word starts from the present realities of earthly things, to which the prophetic and longing spirit attaches the reflection of spiritual things; but in the New Testament the internal truth of reality comes first, and only borrows the garment of figure so far as is necessary for the assistance of the apprehension. We protest again and again against all reference to "figurative style of speaking" in considering these words of our Lord. We think it quite unworthy both of Him and of His sayings to "allege that all this heaped up and repeated imagery will teach no more, after all, than a spiritual union with Him."[1] And when Luther speaks of an "embellished discourse," we lose our respect in a conviction of his prejudice. And whereas Hess regards the Lord "as now first giving to His figure its perfect *round* and finish," we cannot but think that He is pointing it with repulsive *angles, if* it was no more than a mere figure. It sounds pompously enough when Lange says: "The truth, in opposing such a tone of mind on the part of the captious and perverted critics of His words, who will not understand them, adopts the strongest and *proudest* expression, in order to bring the process of hopeless reciprocal excitement to a pure conclusion; the mystery *conceals itself* before those who scorn it, while it confronts them *in the richest array of symbolic language*, and thus sunders itself entirely from them." But we must protest—O no! far be it from us to allow this. Such a proud self-assertion is not to be thought of; there is, indeed, a mystery here, but not a mystery which shrouds itself in concealment, rather is it as plainly disclosed as human language, which cannot but speak of internal processes in figures derived from the external, will per-

[1] So J. v. Müller, who even says—*moral* union, establishing this from ver. 63!

mit. Here is no symbolism, no gorgeous array of imagery, but an inexpressibly humble *offering up* of the sacred truth enforced from Him who speaks. Does not the Lord even now in the holy Supper give up with equal lowliness His flesh and blood to the rude hands of unbelief, just as He then gave up, as a type of this, the word which foreannounced it?

Ver. 55. The true reading is certainly ἀληθῶς, Vulg. *vere*, although the merely diplomatic criticism of Lachmann decides for ἀληθής.[1] Lücke has shown that the connection would require ἀληθῶς, and that ἀληθής, if genuine, must be taken in the same sense, that is with the meaning which, in chap. xv. 1, iv. 23, i. 9, xvii. 3, is expressed by ἀληθινός. Its interpretation is not *sensu proprio* or literally, but *more* than that, inasmuch as everything external is rather the shadow and figure of the *essential* and only *true* relations and things. In this sense the flesh and blood of Christ are truly eaten and drunk, Christ is the true Bread, Corn of Wheat, Vine—the true Foundation as the true Light, the true Door, the essential Way—the true and real Forerunner, Shepherd, Bishop, Physician, Master, Witness, etc., etc. Therefore, away from the presence of this ἀληθῶς with all your idealities and enfeebling abstractions in the place of βρῶσις and πόσις, φαγεῖν and πίνειν, and even of σάρξ; they pretend to explain the truth of the words of Jesus, but they only confuse and abate and mar their meaning. "The Lord was not accustomed elsewhere to speak in this corporeal style; when He spoke of spiritual things He had spiritual words for their conveyance. And when He spoke figuratively He took care that the figure should never contain more than the reality intended; figure with Him is truth, just as His name is Truth. If He would be understood of a spiritual receiving simply, why did He not use the ordinary expressions which are plain and strong enough elsewhere, and why did He not let the matter rest with —bread of life? Wherefore did He go on to speak of flesh, and even of blood? In the word *bread* there was figure enough for the illustration of His meaning; the words *flesh and blood* could give no illustration as a figure. And as He well knew how much the Jews and His own disciples were likely to stumble at

[1] Compare against this, Scheibel das Abendmahl, S. 212–215.

His words, would not His wisdom and His love as a Teacher demand that He should obviate all misunderstanding by the further declaration—*as* ye eat flesh and eat bread, thereby receiving them as food into yourselves, *so* should ye receive Me into your hearts! But He rebuffs all the doubts of the Jews by uttering the words yet more strongly and distinctively, and leaves them no option but to understand that they must eat His flesh and drink His blood. Yea He says expressly—My flesh is *truly* food, My blood is *truly* drink—and that in a sense which is expressly in contrast *with figurative and unreal.*"[1] Yes, verily, just as Lange sets out by saying—though he seems not to be aware what a condemnation he prospectively passes upon his own subsequent abstractions—"He uttered the truth so *concretely*, so distinctively, that He was with His flesh and blood the essential bread of life for the world," etc.! Christ sublimely speaks, beyond all contradiction, of a true and actual partaking, which must be as *corporeally* understood as His glorified flesh and blood must be, and of course in no other sense. But on that account not of a partaking with the mouth, as Kahnis asserts, so that the fulfilment of these words can *only* be found in the Sacrament, and the participation of His flesh must be limited to that of the holy Supper. (S. 123, 126.) For exegesis leaves the question untouched, whether with the bodily mouth or only with the spiritual mouth of the inner man the glorified corporeity of Christ may be, can be enjoyed: that is only a speculative-dogmatic, theosophical question, for the answer of which we must (as Nitzsch says) "enter deeper into the corporeity of Christ generally, into the idea of a spiritual, glorified body," than the doctrine of the Church, on either side, has hitherto done.

Vers. 56, 57. The former words signified—"Thus, My flesh and blood being meat and drink, I am no other than a personal, living *Bread;* according to the general figurative expression which your reference to the Manna at first occasioned Me to use in reply." The Lord now turns to the transitional assurance—"Such partaking of Myself communicates *life* to those who partake, through My inbeing in them, that life which I through the Father

[1] Kapff, Communionbuch, S. 74, 75.

have in Myself." Comp. ch. xv. 4, xvii. 3, v. 26. The διά with Accus. (Vulg. propter) stands here as generally, and it is so acknowledged by Winer, as the causa efficiens, the instrumental means; and for this change of the case in regard to the often interchangeable ideas of "on account of" and "through or by," Winer cites sufficient examples from the classics.[1] We find almost the same thing in the New Testament. Jno. iv. 41, 42, xv. 3; Heb. v. 14 (but not Mark ii. 4). Τρώγων με instead of τὴν σάρκα μου comprehends both in one, in order to prepare for the return to ἄρτος.[2] But it is far from tenable that (according to Brückner's note to de Wette) our Lord *drops* the πιεῖν τὸ αἷμα as only having been occasioned by the accidental circumstance of ver. 52. Oh no, it was with deep earnestness and rigid meaning, without any inducement thereto from without, that He spoke of flesh *and blood* as the interpretation of "bread," and it is only because He is returning back to this original expression that He now speaks only of *eating*, the drinking being obviously included.

Ver. 58 closes calmly and propitiatingly with a simple repetition and summary of the whole discourse. The Lord has five times said—My flesh; four times, in addition to that, My blood; nine times before this has He spoken of bread, and now twice more; and, for the *seventh time* in the whole discourse, as coming *from heaven*. Οὗτός ἐστιν means, with conclusive emphasis—This and of such a kind is the *bread* of which I have spoken; and the οὐ καθώς resolves itself thus—"Not *a bread from heaven* in the manner in which *ye* spake of it, when I was constrained to add καὶ ἀπέθανον." The appended τὸ μάννα is the result of some gloss which aims too accurately to sum up the whole;

[1] "A mediation of life which takes place *through* the Father in such a manner as to make Christ live by the Father's will, because He hath the Father in Himself as the ground of life," Beck, christl. Lehrwissenschaft 1, 460. But I confess that I do not understand what this means. Comp. S. 518. Schulthess persists in interpreting—I live *for His sake*, αὐτὸν δοξάζων—as if this was compatible with that idea of living which enters into this whole discourse.

[2] The Rabbinical אכל משיח, to which Lücke after Lightfoot refers, is not pertinent here, as Baumgarten-Crusius remarks, for it is interchangeable with—eating, enjoying, partaking of the blessings of the Messianic *age*.

it weakens the emphasis of what was designedly spoken without it:—In regard to this bread there is no such thing as *having eaten and are dead;* but for every one who eateth it there is an unlimited ζήσεται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, commencing with the first eating, and going on for *ever.* Thus returning to vers. 47–50, and ver. 32.

APPEAL TO THE OFFENDED DISCIPLES FOR TEST AND DECISION. THE ASCENSION OF THE SON OF MAN: SPIRIT AND LIFE.

(Ch. vi. 61–65.)

This separation between the false and the true disciples through the *public* testimony which Jesus bore to the *mysteries of His Person,* and its *impartation for life,* is not simply in the scheme of the Evangelist a result of this great discourse of our Lord; but his plan, as exact and deeplaid as it is natural, makes it a *general conclusion of its first section.* Between the people and the twelve we find, since ch. iv. 1 (otherwise than as in ch. ii. 2), a class of μαθηταί in the widest sense—dependents, followers. Among these there would naturally be *many* who would be more than ever offended and repelled by our Lord's words, *traversing* as they did every notion they had ever held. But the Lord, who knew and had foreseen their murmurings, utters *to them* especially, and not, as we might imagine the scene, to all the people, a *last word* designed for their *utmost possible instruction,* and to bring them to a *full decision.* First comes the introductory question joining issue with their thoughts, which *detects to them their offence*—"I know it well;" but this put into the form of a question which points to something deeper and beyond. Then comes immediately in ver. 62 a position (deeply to be pondered!) which forms the *transition* from this to the *removal,* if possible, of the offence, and to their further instruction. But the most significant, and properly *fundamental statement* for their instruction is contained in ver. 63; and that not laid down as a general ground-principle merely, but with

express application to the contested and *offending words* which had just been spoken. (This again is to be carefully noted at the outset!) Finally, the *repelling detection* of their unbelief closes all—of that unbelief which was the real ground of their offence; and the word uttered for *full and entire decision*, vers. 64, 65. The principle of stumbling is unbelief, but the ground of unbelief is resistance to the Father's drawing.

The *τίς δύναται ἀκούειν* is the crisis, or worst result, especially in scholastic discussion, of the *πῶς δύναται* which at first only contends about possible interpretation. In this connection *σκληρός* is not simply—unintelligible; nor is the *ἀκούειν* added to it, simply—to understand, to grasp. But the discourse becomes to them, just because they *only too well understood* its literally spoken conclusion, and can hope for no Maschal for its interpretation, a contradictory, insufferable, hard, and as it were indigestible morsel:—a Messiah, who gives Himself to death—in order then to give His flesh and blood to be eaten and drunk![1] On that account *αὐτοῦ* is not to be referred to *λόγος* (as in ch. viii. 43), for then would *ἀκούειν* be rather *intelligere;* but—Who can longer listen to *Him*, and remain with Him as a *μαθητής*? The true parallel is ch. x. 20, and so Nonnus regards it here.[2] *Οὗτος ὁ λόγος* embraces the whole discourse in the Synagogue, which the Evangelist has just described as a *διδάσκειν*; but the offence seizes upon its final and keenest climax. That which so mightily offends these disciples, is not so much, or not alone (as Schleiermacher thinks), that the Lord had so presumptuously placed Himself in a region above the gifts and wonders of Moses and the Old Testament; nor is it merely (as Lange) that He had spoken of Himself as *καταβὰς ἐκ τοῦ*

[1] Lücke has illustrated this meaning of *σκληρός* by Old Testament passages, such as Gen. xlii. 7, xxi. 11, Prov. xv. 1, by the contrast in Eurip. with *μαλθακός*, and especially the "dura vox" of Cicero. Lampe had already given more copious citations, Prov. xviii. 23; Deut. i. 17; 1 Kin. xii. 13; Isa. viii. 12; and especially in the New Testament, Jude 15, according to which the expression non tam absurditatem quam *impietatem* designat. The interpretation which Chrys. and Euthym. support by *δυσπαράδεκτος*, by no means exhausts the meaning; nor can we attach any value to Sepp's notion that the Jews spoke after the later usage of Rabbinical disputation. (See Buxt. Lex. s. v. קשה, the whole article.)

[2] *Καὶ τίς ἀκούειν αὐτοῦ φθεγγομένοιο δυνήσεται.*

οὐρανοῦ; nor *merely* (according to Lücke and Ebrard, as Hase, too, affirms) that He had spoken of His impending death in defiance of all their notions of the Messiah. For, we saw in ver. 52 that it was the δοῦναι φαγεῖν which echoed finally in their ears with offence, though the δοῦναι εἰς θάνατον had previously been heard. The offence did not rest upon "this preeminently, that He had declared Himself to have come down from heaven" (as Hess concisely says), but specifically upon His words concerning the flesh and the blood. But here again *not*, with v. Gerlach, "because they did not apprehend the *spiritual* sense of His words, but stumbled precisely at that," for it is a presumption as gratuitous as groundless to think that they should have so marvellously *spiritualized* the interpretation, as our modern expositors; and then it would be quite unintelligible why the Lord should first say to them—the flesh profiteth nothing! Thus it is almost, though not entirely, as Augustine says upon Ps. xcviii.: Acceperunt enim stulte et carnaliter illud cogitaverunt, putantes, quod præcisurus esset Dominus particulas quasdam de corpore suo et daturus illis. They well understood the literal meaning of His words;[1] and that appeared to them so unintelligent and unpalatable that they—to speak gently—"thought that they could fasten upon Him a charge of fanaticism." This must be firmly established in order to the understanding of the τοῦτο in our Lord's question, and of the whole discourse which then follows.

Vers. 61, 62. "Doth *this* offend you, that ye must ἀληθῶς, in order to have life, eat My flesh and drink My blood?" He well knew that it would be so with them, and nevertheless spoke precisely as He did. Just as He, on many other occasions, repelled individuals who hastily approached Him by words of rigid test, so also here it was His purpose, now, and yet more when they afterwards gave Him occasion, to place them under "strict review" and sift the whole company of these His professed disciples. We say with Lange, "that it is by this tendency[2] that the whole character of these and such like discourses of our Lord is to be explained"—leading, however, to a yet fuller explanation. And

[1] Thus not as Pfenninger superficially says—"a hard saying, for He attached to it eternal life, and no man can tell to what!"

[2] That is, in connection with the constraint which gave it strength.

the words which now follow we must consequently accept in a different sense from that of most of our recent expositors. It is clear that an unexpressed proposition must be supplied before ἐὰν οὖν in the second question, but the general and indefinite τί ῥέξετε of Nonnus, or τί ἐρεῖτε of Euthymius, do not help the matter; since the same question again recurs, as to how that is intended. There are only two suppositions possible: either the Lord would say—Will ye not then *much more*, and then first really be offended? or—Will not your offence be then removed, will ye not then better understand My words?

The former finds more general acceptation; Olshausen, like Tholuck, holds to it without giving any solid reason, Lücke supports it by what he thinks good grounds, and Schleiermacher completes it—"Then will ye be altogether in error concerning Me!" Baumgarten-Crusius gives the most emphatic expression to this interpretation—"If ye now, here in My presence, adhere to your old delusion, how entirely without counsel and strength will ye be when I am gone away?" But we must declare this view to be most unconditionally false; because it sets out with the assumption, first, that the Lord refers in His ἀναβαίνειν merely to His departure in death, and then that the offence did not concern the eating and drinking His flesh and blood. If it concerned—allowing it for a moment—the death of the Messiah, then would the Lord's word here be *almost* a meaningless tautology (as Meyer, de Wette, Ebrard, have it)—Doth it offend you that I must die? What will ye say when that actually comes to pass?[1] But although we do not deny that "in a certain sense death was the external side of His glorification, the return to His Father the glorifying reality of His death," yet we cannot but see that the Lord now, in order to the removal of their stumbling-block, refers only to *this* other *glorifying* aspect or consequence of His going away. In ver. 51, He spoke in connection with the giving His flesh, properly of *dying as such*, and He could not without further explanation speak of that same death as an ascension to heaven where He was before. The offence which commentators take against the bodily and

[1] It seems, moreover, artificial to press the antithesis—Ye are already offended by the λόγος concerning death. but ye shall actually see and find it true, θεωρεῖν.

visible ascension to heaven which is here pointed to,[1] has for its root, alas, a profound unbelief in the necessary actuality of this occurrence, which, together with His miraculous birth itself, would be firmly established in the minds of all who have a right understanding of the entire earthly history of the Logos made flesh, even independently of the sacred narratives which record them. It is impossible that John should have, or present, in his Gospel a "view or point of contemplation," which should contradict the conviction of the church in what took place just in the manner which St Mark or St Luke relate. In the case of the Ascension it is as in the case of Baptism and the Lord's Supper—he assumes and takes for granted the historical fact; and instead of narrating it, he records utterances of our Lord which predict and bear testimony of it. (Besides this place, in ch. iii. 13, and xx. 17; thus this is *not* "the *only* mention of the Ascension on our Lord's own part.") The plainest and most obvious meaning of our Lord's words can be no other than that which afterwards came to pass in accurate correspondence with them. And if any one thinks it out of harmony with truth that the disciples are represented as *seeing* in the future the return and final entrance of the Lord into heaven—an objection which is not met by Lampe's observation that there were probably some there who would see even that—we reply that θεωρεῖν is to be understood of a certain assurance, such as the testimony of the Apostles and the Holy Ghost sent from heaven actually gave to them all, and which was equivalent to the evidence of their having themselves seen, Acts ii. 33. Kling (Stud. u. Krit.) defends this most triumphantly, by the striking parallel —"that ἐὰν θεωρῆτε is no more to be literally understood of a beholding the ἀναβαίνειν, than the ὄψεσθε of Matt. xxvi. 64 is to be taken literally."

But now, finally, for the main point in which we find the perfect decision of the question! Our inmost conviction assures us that our Lord must here have designed to say something which would remove difficulty and *propitiate*, and to dismiss these departed disciples with some ray of hope for the future; it

[1] Which, men are even bold enough to say, contradicts the character of St John's view.

must have been His aim, as we said before, as far as possible to attempt their instruction.[1] Now it is quite contradictory to this ground-tone of our Saviour's present discourse to regard Him as announcing that they should receive still greater offence in time to come; that would have been indeed a σκληρότερος λόγος. We cannot see (with Kling) that the οὖν, which often merely takes up and continues what precedes, decisively opposes the supplemented sense which we refer to; and all the less, as it was assuredly the general interpretation of the older church, which accepted the οὖν, though with a less rigorous meaning. Suffice it, that the Lord signifies and promises here a future *removal of the offence*, a subsequent better knowledge, when His present earthly manifestation should be finally withdrawn, just as in ch. viii. 28.[2] There, however, the allusion is only general; here there is special application to the ascension which takes Him up as the Son of man, that is, even His flesh and His blood, in the likeness of common flesh and blood, in itself being without spirit and life:—for this was the subject treated of here. He thus mentions what might be understood of itself from the preceding ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβέβηκα, and for the sake of comforting both Himself and them, that they would after that be able better to understand the πῶς δύναται of ver. 52. *For*—and this must be carefully noted!—He speaks not as dismissing those who were insincere only, whose return was not to be expected, but rather to that better class of which many afterwards believed; and for *these* He could not have intended to say—τοῦτο ὑμᾶς οὐ πολλῷ μᾶλλον σκανδαλίσει;[3] If not put so forcibly as Chemnitz does: Qui enim potest suam carnem contra carnis naturam cœlestem facere, idem etiam eam cibum hominum vivificum efficere potest; yet at least we may say—Then will ye find My words concern-

[1] With which even Lücke agrees: "That Jesus said nothing to remove their offence, but what would have a tendency to increase it, is scarcely imaginable." He then finds it removed in ver. 63, after being increased; but we cannot understand ver. 63 itself without the transition in ver. 62 concerning the *glorification of His corporeity*.

[2] For which Kahnis decides (with Calvin, Grotius, Lampe now), and with appeal to Stier.

[3] Lampe adduces this reason, when he says: In priori sensu (*quanto* magis) verba hæc nonnisi spuriis, in posteriori (an adhuc) etiam veris discipulis Christi opponi poterant, unde *hunc* potissimum amplectimur.

ing the eating My flesh not so hard as ye do now. Ver. 62 continues in the same tone of reproving question as ver. 61, but it gives also a doctrinal statement as a key to the right understanding.

And what kind of a lesson is it? We do not add much to our apprehension of it by supplying—Will not then the offence be weakened? For this supplement is obviously to be understood according to one of two opposite views Grotius represents the one: nam corpore meo *procul* in cœlum *amoto*, nulla spes erit ejus manducandi *κατὰ κυριολεξίαν*. But our whole exposition has tended to overturn this view, which we shall again have to do with upon ver. 63. We therefore apply it to the other view, and expand it thus: *Then will it be disclosed to you that, and in what way, My human corporeity, become heavenly and glorified, may be given to be eaten and to be drunk.*

Does any one think that this is not yet plain enough, and feel a necessity that Jesus should expressly say—"How, if I shall institute the Supper, in which My flesh and My blood will be offered under the emblems of bread and wine"—we can only say that this is most marvellous folly. For Jesus has not, as we have said before, spoken only, or even preeminently, of a sacramental participation of Him; He afterwards gives to His own the Sacrament as a holy thing, the express description of which in the hearing of these unbelievers would have been a profanation as inappropriate as it would have been useless and confounding. Even the little company of His faithful ones understood and truly received the Sacrament only after His ascension; and, to obviate even in them every false notion of its nature, the Lord must fully establish and plainly declare the great truth which we shall now approach.

Ver. 63. Baumgarten-Crusius, an expositor whose view of the entire discourse we are compelled most decidedly to protest against, remarks nevertheless very properly—"That even the first clause (*τὸ πνεῦμα—οὐδέν*) is not designed to lay down a general proposition, but has definite reference to the present time and the subject in hand." But when we understand this aright, how much follows from it! The universal incontrovertible axiom, which is laid down as fundamental, is conveyed in the great and widely-applicable utterance—It is *the Spirit*, who,

or properly which, *giveth life* or quickeneth. He who has understood the Lord's words to Nicodemus and the woman of Samaria, will also understand this saying, which now is, as it were, drawn out and brought forward from the central heart of those discourses. *Life*, in that higher meaning in which the Lord promises and brings it to us, has its original seat in *spirit;* and in the highest sense it is only the Spirit, who proceedeth from God whose nature is Spirit, and who cometh to us through the Son, that can *make alive* our dead spirits. Thus far the fundamental thought is perfectly the same with that which the Apostle Paul afterwards so often utters; but in this case there is placed in antithesis to the πνεῦμα something very different from the γράμμα of 2 Cor. iii. 6; and in this we perceive a modification of the general axiom to suit its special application to the thing intended here. Here the antithesis is ἡ σάρξ,—and what is that? It cannot mean the general idea of the natural corruption of humanity, all that is born of the flesh, and is itself flesh, or man's carnal condition of sin and death (although this from Gen. vi. 3 down to Rom. viii. 2, 3, and through the entire Scriptures, forms the most common antithesis to πνεῦμα); for οὐκ ὠφελεῖ οὐδέν intends to say πρὸς τὸ ζωοποιεῖν,[1] and the reference must be to something which can quicken the σαρκικούς. We are not aware, however, that any one has ever sought to establish the application of this antithesis, without further qualification, to our present passage. But there have been many who have declared themselves in favour of another very inapplicable notion of the contrast, which we shall not be long occupied in refuting. They understand in σάρξ the carnal, externally literal *meaning of the words;*[2] but none of them has ever attempted to prove that either πνεῦμα or σάρξ simply could bear such a meaning as this antithesis assigns to each. But inasmuch as a carnal or spiritual meaning of a discourse may at the same time be taken as a carnal or spiritual *apprehension* of it, or *capacity of understanding it*, this view passes over into another, which is

[1] As Tertullian (though with a wrong apprehension of the whole)—ad vivificandum scilicet.

[2] Tertullian: the sensus carnalis, against the spiritualis; just so August., Chrys., Theophyl., etc. Wesley too—The spiritual meaning of these words—the bare, carnal, literal meaning.

fitly expressed by the τὸ σαρκικῶς—πνευματικῶς νοεῖν of Euthymius; and they who hold it talk in various ways of the earthly-prejudiced, unspiritual minds of the disciples, of their carnal notions; as, for example, Klee speaks of their "fleshly and prejudiced acceptation of His words." But this altogether overlooks the plain fact that simply and necessarily *ex vi oppositi* the Lord is not speaking of what might be useless to the understanding and acceptance of His words, of what would never be able to discover their truth,[1] but of what *could not quicken or give life.* Not to press, that then οὐκ ὠφελεῖ οὔδεν would be saying *too little* for the misunderstanding, perversion, and offence which, according to this view, the σάρξ produces. It is of course true that it was the carnal mind and apprehension of the disciples which only thought of the flesh when the Lord's words fell on their ears; this was a consequence involved in His words or was presupposed in them, but this could not possibly be the immediate and essential meaning of His expression, for it says nothing about the flesh which should understand, but of *that which was understood.* Jesus brings graciously into full prominence the fundamental truth which lay under their misunderstanding and offence, in order to confirm it in the light of the preceding great declaration concerning the πνεῦμα ζωοποιοῦν, and thus to say—If I had intended the word which I spoke in this sense, ye would have been right in repelling me with your τί ὠφελήσει ἡμᾶς ἡ σάρξ—*but in this sense I intended it not!*

Every view which refuses to entertain this immediate reference of ἡ σάρξ to that σκληρὸς λόγος περὶ τῆς σαρκός, is out of harmony with the subject and the discourse;[2] and it is remarkable to observe, in connection with this, how much violence is done to the words in order to invalidate their meaning. Nothing is more simply sure in *this* contrast between πνεῦμα and σάρξ as *in relation to the promised* ζωοποιεῖν *through a* σάρξ *to be eaten,* than what the oft-misapprehended Calvin in his unbiassed and acute words expresses—Caro, si a spiritu separetur; just as

[1] As the Berlenb. Bibel this time so grossly misses the meaning—"The flesh is of no avail *for true exposition*, a spirit must be there. Every carnal manner of treating the subject."

[2] We may be excused from entering polemically into the great mass of contradictory opinions.

Augustin had also said—Accedat spiritus ad carnem, et prodest plurimum; and Bengel very clearly—"Caro *mera* nihil prodest, qualem scilicet Judæi *putabant* esse carnem illam, de quâ loquebatur Jesus, cf. 2 Cor. v. 16. Loquitur *sub conditione*, eâque impossibili, *si sola caro esset*, uti etiam loquitur v. 38 de sua voluntate."[1] The flesh *in itself* as flesh, which should have no spirit, as ye understood it.[2] That *can*, indeed, most assuredly give no life of God to those who are dead in sins, since itself in a lower sense is only living through an indwelling πνεῦμα.[3] But we have already unconditionally denied that our Lord could here speak thus of His own flesh; so that we might dare to add, *e.g.*, with Grotius—ne mea quidem; or assert boldly with Schulthess that Jesus in so speaking included His own flesh, *yea, had it especially in view;* or say superficially with Fikenscher—"in My flesh itself your salvation does not lie, but in the *spiritual enjoyment* of My flesh!" For if *the flesh* is to be spiritually eaten, yet that which is to be eaten is a spiritual *flesh*.

Thus it was pure folly in Zwingli to use this ἡ σάρξ ὠφελεῖ οὐδέν for his continual, tenacious motto against the mystical reality in the Sacrament, and to defend himself against the objection by saying—Caro Christi omnino plurimum, immo immensum prodest; sed ut diximus, cæsa *non ambesa*. Cæsa nos servavit a cæde, sed ambesa penitus nihil prodest. Against which, Lampe (who, however, otherwise only deals with the discourse in a dogmatically prejudiced and enfeebling way) has well observed—Sed ita iterum pro unâ ellipsi duplex statuenda erit. Non solum enim tum *carnem* in genere nominans *suam* intelligit, verum etiam non simpliciter carnem suam, sed *manducationem carnis suæ* inutilem declarat. It is very much to be deplored that in our own day theologians follow in the steps of Zwingli; as, for example, Schenkel (against Alban Stolz, Gesetzeskirche und Glaubenskirche, S. 26), who professes to find

[1] And with equal correctness before—Non est sermo hoc loco de carne corruptâ, de quâ nemo dubitat, quin nihil prosit.

[2] This corresponds literally with the τὴν σάρκα ver. 52, without the αὐτοῦ which here makes the great difference.

[3] And this, with a *slight touch* at the lower analogy, Beza would improperly make the only sense of this deep word. Vos sensus ipse docet, *ne hanc quidem vitam animalem* manare a carne,—utpote quæ aliunde, nempe ab *hominis spiritu*, *corpus vivificante* proficiscatur.

in Cyril his own position, concerning the *Capernaite* error that the substance of Christ was to be *bodily* eaten, not clearly understanding his πνευματικῶς and σαρκοφαγία. We say with the Hirschberger Bibel (which indeed afterwards holds only to the "carnal method and spirit")—"It cannot be thought, without ascribing to the Lord a contradiction of His own previous words, that in saying *the* flesh, not by any means *My* flesh, He could have meant to utter anything which might be applied in any measure to His own flesh, after He had again and again said that *His own* most sacred flesh should be the true life-giving food for man." We refer to Scheibel's often quoted work, who, in page 174, with well-grounded and holy zeal, asks—And is it that the body of Jesus οὐκ ὠφελεῖ οὐδέν?[1] Luther found it hard to defend himself against Zwingli, because he had concealed from himself the true meaning of the entire chapter. At first he incautiously assented—It may be very true that even the flesh of Christ profited nothing, but yet it is in the Supper, where as being without the Spirit, it truly profiteth nothing. He then retracted this admission, and maintained confidently afterwards that in this passage the flesh of Christ was not referred to, falling back upon the exposition which we have rejected, of a "carnal interpretation." Finally, he called it one of the flattest blasphemies, that Zwingli and Œcolampadius should dare to maintain the flesh of Christ to be of no profit, eaten carnally, *just as if it were mere empty flesh, in which no Divinity was.*[2] And in this last he was altogether right, for, as Bugenhagen once expressed himself in a letter to Hess—"if Christ had in these words spoken of His own flesh, He would have denied Himself, for He had said shortly before that His flesh should be the life of the world."

From this right apprehension of the second clause a peculiar light is shed back upon the first, so that the declaration "id quod spiritus est, vivificans est" should be, properly speaking, inverted for the application here—*That which* quickeneth, thus My flesh

[1] Plank, indeed, thinks this rather an ingenious evasion.

[2] In the Tischreden (Förstemann i. 74) we find it in the strongest manner—God's flesh.—On another occasion, and without perceiving how far it would carry him, his exposition makes Christ say—"*My* flesh and blood hath the power and force which God hath, it makes Divine, and will fill you with God."

concerning which I have asserted this, is πνεῦμα, not mera caro. *My* flesh hath and giveth Spirit! This almost coincides with Storr's expression—"My higher, heavenly, and Divine nature, not the human flesh in itself; *but that penetrates this through*—even unto its *words*." Only that this last interpretation of the following part of the verse, to which we are now led, we must entirely reject.

That Spiritualism, which would escape from the Lord's flesh, has found plentiful help in this statement; it now rushes with impetuous confidence to the next, altogether forgetting that in this concluding clause there must lie an immediate application of what is there said *to the words which had given the offence.* It contrives so to generalise and etherialise the Lord's most decisive declaration, as to find in it a most manifest confirmation of the "spiritual sense" and "spiritual participation" which it had set out with. But the Lord does not say, as Grotius reads, πνευματικά ἐστι; or—πνευματικῶς λεγόμενα, as Schulthess expresses it—The words which I have spoken are of a spiritual meaning, of anagogical, mystical interpretation; but He says something very different.

What then are the ῥήματα which He here means? It is very important for understanding this that the λελάληκα is established by pretty general consent as the right reading, and not λαλῶ. Thus it is *not* the words of the Lord, or His doctrine, His testimony generally, as in ch. iii. 34, v. 47, xiv. 10, xv. 7, xvii. 8. A meaning may indeed be extracted from the λελάληκα such as this—"The words which I have so long, so often, and so much spoken to you already;"[1] but, taking into account the entire development of the connection, according to which the Lord is aiming to give as much explanation as possible to take away their offence, and at the same time to show the reason why He had not *spoken* otherwise than He did, this λελάληκα, especially with the ὑμῖν, can only be regarded as referring to the object of their offence (the τοῦτο with which He began). The Lord never said before His glorification—Receive ye the Spirit through My

[1] Thus Lange, according to whom our Lord makes His future operation clear *through His operation in the past;* so that it meant—*thus have I long begun already* to feed you with My flesh and blood. Against all this we have only to insinuate our earnest note of interrogation.

words; ch. vii. 39 utters an earnest protest against this. Thus He *could* not have here intended—" Ye receive *this* Spirit, in order to partaking of My flesh in the right manner, out of My words, which themselves are spirit and life!" (von Gerlach). In the highest degree treacherous, as it regards the opposite fundamental scriptural view, is the remark of Lücke—" Death took away the σάρξ of the Redeemer; but there remained to them His πνεῦμα, that which was *essential!*" No, verily, *it remained with them not;* but came to them, even as He had promised, first after His glorification. And does this in any way quarrel with St John's point of contemplation? With rather more caution does Baumgarten-Crusius express himself, when he makes it mean—" *For the present* the most spiritual thing to which they could be referred, was His presence in His *words;* for indeed *in them they might already have* the Spirit for whom they hoped, and the life which He had promised to them."

We are assuredly very far from detracting from the profound truth and meaning of Peter's confession in ver. 68, or from denying the living power of the Spirit-words of Jesus; *now* that He has gone up to His glory, we ourselves maintain in the strongest manner that the words which come from Him to us with the Holy Ghost, and which are accompanied and filled by His influence, however we may hear them or read them on paper, bring to us (in the unity of His flesh and blood) spirit and life.[1] But that the *words* of Jesus as such could have been, before the obtaining and outpouring of the Holy Spirit, actually ζωοποιοῦντα, we must decline to admit; moreover, we most inflexibly deny that nothing more than this was the meaning of His words concerning σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα, and that He here gives His explanation of these words.[2] Then would everything come back to His *doctrine* and *teaching* again, through which or in

[1] Basil. M. adv. Eunom. libr. V. wrote with converse truth—θεοῦ λόγος ὁ υἱός, ῥῆμα δὲ υἱοῦ τὸ πνεῦμα.

[2] Although, *e.g.*, Petersen (i. 192) so expounds them. Steffens has put it most strongly, with an otherwise good intention (Wie ich wieder ein Lutheraner wurde, u. s. w.)—" His words *are* Himself, are Spirit and Life!" But we cannot allow even these more tolerable applications to stand as exegesis, such, for instance, as Pfenninger's well-intentioned—Yea, His words are God's words, Spirit and quickening power (already) are in them; yea, *much more* than that, *Himself*, His whole being!

which the Spirit could exert His energy; and σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα would be no more than—*figures*. "I confess"—says the mild Kling, with dignity opposing Lücke—"that I was altogether astounded at seeing such an expositor consenting to this view of the profound discourse of the Redeemer. How inappropriately and perversely must Jesus then have expressed Himself in vers. 51, 53–56! Is *He Himself*, who offers Himself as living bread, identical with the contents of His own utterance concerning His person? Is His flesh and blood, which men must receive into themselves in order to obtain eternal life, no other than His doctrine?! If Jesus had so spoken, then would He truly not have been the personal Wisdom, and His words would *not have been* spirit and life!" How does it rejoice one of us to be able to speak, with even only not absolute agreement, in the words of an academical theologian! But that joy is a little disturbed, when Kling's subsequent interpretation forbids my concurrence: —"The words which He had spoken, were pure spirit and life; Divine in their kind and in their original, and living words throughout."

For my own part I am exegetically bound to maintain that the Lord specially signifies by τὰ ῥήματα the great words σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα. Lücke insists that if that distinctive former language was now intended, ταῦτα τὰ ῥήματα should have been used, as in ch. viii. 20, x. 21. But, in these parallel passages, the subject referred to was something immediately preceding; now, some interval and interruption had transpired, so that ταῦτα would scarcely be in keeping, but ἃ λελάληκα ὑμῖν, that is, "What I spoke to you in my last sayings just before," would be precisely so.[1] Scheibel: "It is hermeneutica sui ipsius, and of the preceding saying—the words which I have spoken are to be under-

[1] Bengel makes a critical distinction that He says not λαλῶ—jam enim aversi erant. Moreover, that *here* the *quoting* λαλεῖν stands instead of λέγειν, does not contradict what is said later upon ch. viii. 25. Even in ch. viii. 28 it stands ταῦτα λαλῶ. Here in ch. vi. the form of the expression is so intended—thus and not otherwise have I *spoken*. Thus when Kahnis (v. Abendm. S. 122) rejects my exposition that it refers to the contents of the last-spoken words, on the ground of the "universal character of the declaration," we can only confidently ask—Where is this universal character? We read the opposite.

stood of Him who is spirit and life."[1] In order to this it is not absolutely necessary, with Bengel, to press ῥήματα into דְּבָרִים, *res* verbis comprehensæ: yet the ἐστὶ, *twice* repeated with emphasis, and specially corresponding in each case, is a continuous *exposition*, just as that first ὁ ἄρτος ἡ σάρξ μου ἐστίν, ver. 51. So now again—ἡ σάρξ μου πνεῦμά ἐστι, καὶ τὸ αἷμά μου ζωή ἐστιν. If I give My flesh in order to quicken, it is as a vessel of the πνεῦμα; My blood a vehiculum of the ζωή.[2] This is said, on the one hand, for an abiding protest against every carnal and grovelling misunderstanding which would cling to the σάρξ; but, on the other, it will by no means abate in the very least the true, though heavenly, corporeity of Him who is gone up with flesh and blood. Indeed he who can say (like Schulthess, v. Abendm. S. 57)—"The *true* body of Christ is related to the body which was crucified and buried, as the *true* bread which He declared Himself to be, is to *perishable* food," must refuse to hear and read what He Himself has said—My *flesh* is this true bread! He can have no clear idea of what the flesh of Christ is, because either he is wanting in faith in the *incarnation* of the Logos, or does not perceive clearly its consequences. The great result is the receiving from Christ's corporeity His *flesh and blood;* not merely *imperishableness*, but much more than that.

Where, then, may the flesh and blood of Christ have remained? What did they become? Did He to that end rise again bodily —to give back His corporeity as "perishable" to the dust, to be resolved into nothing? As Dav. Schulz applies even to the flesh of Christ (known to have risen, and to have been taken up into

[1] The highly respectable English commentator Alford says of my interpretation—It seems to me beyond question the right meaning.

[2] That is also very different from the converse—"the true body of Christ is thus all which truly served as the veil and the instrument of His Spirit." Rather would we maintain that all which now brings to us the Spirit and life of Christ participates in the outpourings and influences of His everywhere present flesh and blood. Even Bretschneider has discerned the exegetical truth from his point of view, when he says in his Probabilia—Corpus hoc, *in se spectatum*, non habet vim vivificantem, sed πνεῦμα, λόγος πνευματικὸς *cum eo conjunctus* hanc vim *communicat* cum eo. Σάρξ ergo *sola* si comederetur, nemini daret vitam; sed σάρξ cum cœlesti spiritu conjuncta id efficit.

heaven!), what 1 Pet. i. 24. predicts of πᾶσα σάρξ!?[1] What meant it then that the *Son of man* should come again? The self-same Person, which formerly was the Son of man, now as a

[1] We have spoken in our exposition of the Epistle to the Hebrews, ch. i. 308, of the question what became of the *poured out blood* of Christ, though in a manner very offensive to our modern theology. We cannot abate this offence now, and least of all as it confronts us in the strange criticism of Münchmeyer, who blames my opposition to the Lutheran doctrine, while he himself understands Jno. vi. very unecclesiastically as meaning solely a *sacramental* participation, and who would do well to study my other writings before he attacks one of them with an entire misunderstanding. His protest against my doctrine concerning the blood ventures to affirm, in plain opposition to the Lutheran doctrine of the Supper, and the words of institution themselves, that—the blood *which was shed* (which yet we drink) is as utterly lost as the wood of the cross! We say nothing of the entire ignorance of all Christological anthropology which lies at the bottom of such protests as these. We will now in this second edition condense for our readers who may not possess the work on the Hebrews, what we have advanced there, on ch. ix. 13, 14. "Now arises a bold, yet obvious question—Whither went that blood of the God-man when it was shed, that blood containing in itself bodily and really the spiritual energy of all quickening out of the life of Christ?—The Lord's spilt blood, one may suppose, could not actually and bodily come into the holiest of all. Where did it then remain, and what became of it? we ask with all solemnity. Might this sacred blood be lost, absorbed, and come to nothing in the soil of Gethsemane and Golgotha? Far be it from us to think so! that contradicts the assured truth of a Resurrection and glorification of all the corporeity of the God-man, which once taken upon Him was never to be laid aside. If the Father keepeth all the *bones* of His Holy One, so that not one of them should be broken in the true Paschal Lamb (Ps. xxxiv. 20; John xix. 36); if also the *flesh* of the Holy One of God lay in the grave secure from corruption and waiting for new life and spiritualisation (Ps. xvi. 9, 10);—should the *blood* be lost and perish? Far be it, we say once more. (We may add now—With *us* the blood is mere element of physical, mortal life, but the blood in His case was also penetrated and pervaded by the πνεῦμα αἰώνιον.) The treatment of this subject by earlier theologians may have been conducted in a very irreverent manner, repulsive even to the faithful, but there is a profound Truth and Light at its foundation. It is plain, at the outset, that the blood of Christ, as pertaining to His humanity, shared in His glorification, since it is present and communicable, in the Sacrament. But if you ask further—Are the outpourings of the blood of Christ, from the first drops in His bloody sweat to the final stream from His side, which indeed the Omnipotence of God could keep in permanent being, just as a similar power works in the resurrection of every human body—restored to His body again, or do they exist independently of it? The word of the Risen

bodiless spirit—and yet to appear, and be seen when He comes? What are we to do with passages such as Phil. iii. 21; Col. ii. 9?

Saviour is the first answer, when He said to His disciples—Handle Me and see, for a spirit hath not *flesh and bones*, as ye see Me have. (Luke xxiv. 39.) The Lord did not say, nor could He say—*flesh and blood;* for, as another Scripture reveals to us, flesh and blood in that union and combination which belongs to this lower, earthly, mortal life of the body, cannot inherit the kingdom of God, nor thus enter into incorruption. (1 Cor. xv. 50.) Did then the Ascension unite the blood, collected in the meanwhile below, and preserved, with the hitherto bloodless resurrection body? For the same reason we answer, no. And what need we ask, when the distinctive and decisive answer is plainly given in the Holy Sacrament? His glorified *flesh*, which now is called His body of itself, and His shed *blood*, both, in conjunction one with the other, and independently one of the other, still sundered as they had been separated at the Cross, the offered up body and the *poured* out blood are given us by the Lord to be eaten and drunk. Does not this give us to understand why, after John vi. and the Institution of the Supper, the New Testament speaks so distinctively of the blood of Christ? Moreover, let us read in the Epistle to the Hebrews, what is written in chapter xii. 22–24! In connection with the enumerated *realities*—Ye are come to Mount Zion, to the city of God, to the multitude of thousands of *angels*, to the congregation of the first-born, to the Judge and *God* of all, to the *spirits* of perfected saints, to Jesus the Mediator of the New Covenant—and then we read at the close, in connection with and after the person of the glorified Saviour Himself—after the holy seven-number yet another and last reality—*and to the blood of* sprinkling, which speaketh better than that of Abel! Then must this most holy blood exist as separate in heaven."—Let it be observed how the so-called "Johannean Christ" and the so-called "Author of the Epistle to the Hebrews" coincide, and let us learn to apprehend the whole New Testament as one γραφή with a systematic connection. To acknowledge the authority of the already itself apocalyptic epistle to the Hebrews, and to submit to be led by it onwards to its τελειότης (chap. vi. 1), is both the result and the test of a true understanding of Scripture, just as the Apocalypse itself is. Compare what Beck has said, almost in accord with ourselves, concerning the blood of Christ (Lehrwissenschaft, S. 626–629, in the note). He, however, protests against Bengel and the "separated existence of the blood in heaven." For my own part I did not derive this doctrine from Bengel, nor from Oetinger (who holds it fully, see in Auberlen S. 272–276), but from the Scriptures alone,—not one word of which can be broken, however paradoxical they may appear—nor from Materialism, as Lange insinuates (iii. 614). This latter thinks that I need no more disturb myself about the shed blood of Christ than about the sweat or the tears!—but where then is the Scriptural "glory of the Logos as the life of all things?" Holy Writ surely speaks differently of the *blood* and of the tears!

If we entertain such ethereal, spiritualising notions of the ascension of Christ, as would make the plain account of His actual, bodily, visible presence at the end, a mere Docetic representation or myth,[1] then should we do better to consider with the German Catholics (in my first edition—the late; in this—some time since!) whether we had not better give up altogether the festival of the Ascension. (As an article in one of their Synodal organs then directed.) The Scripture, however, tells us that the *bodily humanity* of the ἔσχατος Ἀδάμ is made and is become εἰς πνεῦμα ζωοποιοῦν. (1 Cor. xv. 45.) What the Lord told Nicodemus, and what He afterwards spake at Capernaum, form together mutually complementing truths. He brings down *for us* through His going up, spirit and life (chap. iii. 13)—but He *hath* already the Spirit in Himself, though veiled in the flesh, and confined in its out-beaming power. According to Acts ii. 33 He did not then first receive on high the Holy Ghost from the Father, but freedom and power to pour out upon *us* the fulfilment of His *promise.* For in Jno. vii. 39 the glorification of His σάρξ in order to the streaming forth of the water of life *from His body* (as we shall expound on ver. 38 there), must be taken in connection with the ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο of His birth.

A Capernaite κρεωφαγία and αἱματοποσία cannot assuredly be the question here. Calvin penetrates with considerable clearness into the mystery, when we find him once saying—Carnem Christi sine ullis ambagibus fatemur esse vivificam, quia—eadem illa caro vitam in nos spirat—nam ex abscondito Deitatis fonte in Christi carnem mirabiliter infusa est vita, *ut inde ad nos flueret.* Quite right, but this *inde fluere* is not quite enough, it does not amount to the *eating*, of which the Lord spoke. We must most absolutely decide that in the *glorified Christ first* we are to discern the κοινωνία καὶ ἕνωσις σαρκὸς καὶ πνεύματος, of which Irenæus speaks in relation to the Sacrament.[2] We may, with

[1] Or those which will allow Lücke to say, "the thought of the glorified flesh of Christ, seems to me to be quite strange to John even after the resurrection!" as if he did not record the finger in the print of the nails, and, at the same time, the coming through the closed doors. Was not that indeed a beginning of the glorification? Not yet, assuredly, the perfect glorification.

[2] And indeed in a yet stronger sense in the *glorified* Christ, than that in which Ignatius ascribed it to the Person of the God-man generally.

D. Schulz, admit a σῶμα πνευματικόν, but protest against a σὰρξ πνευματική, for, as Olshausen pertinently says, "it does not appear what there could be pneumatic in the σῶμα, but just the σάρξ itself." Thus there is the most perfect communicatio idiomatum now (although not previously in the condition of κένωσις); thus also the rejected ubiquitas corporis (namely, that which, as ever possible to the Lord's will, comes into fact in His church) as it is almost literally declared in such passages as Eph. iv. 10; Col. ii. 9. Not indeed that absolute, and simply impossible thing of exaggerated Lutheranism! To these depths point, and of these mysteries testifies the Word which we have now expounded—mysteries which shall be, when the Son of man, *remaining a Son of man*, shall go back again to heaven where before His *becoming man* He was. The ἐστί of this saying is partly prophetic, as it refers to the meaning and contents of the words which were spoken for futurity; and it has also a well-grounded truth in the concealed mystery of His Divine life for the moment in which He uttered it.

Vers. 64, 65. These words are not so straitly connected with the preceding as Kling thinks, who would on that account change the punctuation; but the second part of the discourse follows here. The detected offence was first set aside, as far as it might be, by instruction, explanation, and reference to the future; but now, as it is fit, the offence itself, or rather its disclosed principle, unbelief in the Teacher come from heaven, is reproved and corrected. *Here* first would we refer, after this entire process of thought, the carnal apprehension which it has been sought to discover in σάρξ. The Lord has previously been placing the object of their misunderstanding in the clearest possible light; but now He predicts, in addition, that as the disciples through their own deep guilt have not understood Him yet (have not remarked the πνεῦμα of that σάρξ which should ζωοποιεῖν), so they will not for the same reason understand and accept the explanation which He has just given. "*But* I may say what I will, My strongest μαρτυρεῖν and plainest διδάσκειν finds no entrance where it finds no faith!" Ἐξ ὑμῶν τινές, although there were πολλοί,[1]—is the

[1] Roos has it otherwise: Not all who murmured were thus unbelieving. *Many* disciples murmured, but only *some of them* believed not. That might pass, if (as Roos himself mentions) the first πολλοί did not come back in ver. 66.

mild utterance of our Lord which confirms what we have just said, that He directed His words not only to those who were entirely departing from Him. The εἴρηκα ὑμῖν should teach us that the quite parallel λελάληκα ὑμῖν is just in the same way to be understood—The Lord refers, both in the one and in the other, to His own previous words. But here the ὑμῖν has a yet narrower application—Even to you My disciples and not merely to the mass of the people have I spoken and addressed these words! Even your hitherto ἐλθεῖν πρός με and περιπατεῖν μετ' ἐμοῦ was not the right and actual coming, without the obedience of faith responding to the drawing of the Father, without the hearing of trust in order to learn.

The parenthetical observation of the Evangelist points at the close of this section to its beginning, with which he closes the whole; hence ἐξ ἀρχῆς refers not simply to ipsum hujus sermonis tempus, as the ἀρχή with relation to the future indicated in ver. 62, but it must be understood as in ch. ii. 24, 25—From the beginning of His dealing with each He knew his character. At the same time the Evangelist goes forward preparatorily and transitionally to the following record; for, he adds to the τίνες of the disciples generally, an allusion to the τίς from among the twelve in particular. And the εἰσίν οἱ μὴ πιστεύοντες of the former describes what was now passing in the present; while the ἐστίν ὁ παραδώσων of the latter points to the *future* as now present to the Lord.[1]

The immediate result approved the truth of these last words. The many turned away ἐκ τούτου, that is, from this critical moment they also externally turned away, as they had never been inwardly turned towards Him; and returned not back (so long at least as the Lord was thus surrounded by following disciples, no more is to be found in it than that); were of the same mind till the ascension of the Son of man. That there were among them such as fell away from the beginning of faith is very possible; though it is almost denied by the μὴ πιστεύοντες of our Lord, and the οὐκέτι μετ' αὐτοῦ περιεπάτουν of the Evangelist.

[1] And not as Tholuck says, "that Judas *might* from his tone of mind become His betrayer."

APPEAL TO THE TWELVE. WILL YE ALSO? ONE OF YOU IS—!

(Ch. vi. 67, 70).

The false disciple, found, alas, even in the narrowest circle of the *twelve*,[1] and patiently borne with by Jesus, goes not away indeed, but even through his hypocritical remaining becomes a διάβολος—yet shall he not remain unwarned and unexhorted; the Lord reveals him to himself without revealing him, just as far as it was wholesome and fitting. The first, *testing* question was itself uttered pre-eminently on account of this Judas, though it evoked a blessed confession of their faith from the others; hence no commendation here responds to it (as in Matt. xvi. 17), but only a second question, which scarcely retains its warning tone to the *lost one*, but only detects him, and as a warning to his fellow-apostles, as *one among them!*

Ver. 67. According to strict rule the μή in this question should indicate—Ye will *not then* go away?[2] The rule, however, is not quite so rigorous, as even Winer admits; and we might accept the question thus, conformably with our Lord's meaning—Will ye, too, or *any one* among you? This certainly must have been the undertone to Judas, even if we conceive the tone and sense of the question to have been quite negative—expecting neither yes nor no. In putting this inexpressibly affecting question to His chosen twelve the Lord was not, indeed, in His inmost soul indifferent; but He did with design and self-repression propose it calmly as an actual *question*, awaiting their reply. This must then, as now, have been *felt*, though not perceptible in the few words themselves. It cannot be the Lord's *will* that any one should ever turn away from Him, and these twelve He had in a special manner *chosen!* The decision, nevertheless, He ever and

[1] In which designation, it must be remarked, St John speaks as *taking it for granted.*

[2] Hence many understand, and we find it in de Wette, unaltered by Brückner—"I hope not!" So that it is expounded as a question of "sorrow seeking consolation."

in every case leaves to the *will* of man. That was the principle and reason of the withdrawal of the other disciples; thus plainly announced in order that we may beware of attributing to the drawing of the Father anything like compulsion, or of supposing in the lack of the Father's gift anything like a decree of reprobation. It is altogether inconsistent with our Saviour's dignity, especially in connection with this chapter, to understand in the question an appeal of sorrow, demanding consolation—Ye, My own twelve, will not forsake Me too? Rather does the Lord speak thus to His Apostles—If it be your will, too, then leave Me, ye are free to do so, I restrain you not—just as God spake in former times to Israel by Joshua, Josh. xxiv. 15. But it is not less true that such an appeal to their own free-will is the mightiest possible appeal to their hearts.

Peter instantly replies in the name of the others; as he thinks, in the name of all. He first seizes on the *going away*, and strengthens the idea, so strange to him, in his ἀπελευσόμεθα. "Very sure it is that we cannot counsel or help ourselves; *to whom*, then, can we go, as our Master and guide? The Baptist is no longer with us,—are we then to go back to the Rabbis again?" The very thought of this was sore affliction to him. No, *we* remain *Thy* disciples! He apprehends that which the Lord had said in ver. 63, with the same general half-interpretation in which so many remain at the present time, and which has its truth in hearts like Peter's, though the Lord intended it in another sense. Yet Peter's words mean something different, and indeed more just, than if he had said—Thy words are spirit and are life. He uses them with the genitive of their contents —They *speak of* eternal life, they *promise* it to us;—thus much is clear to us with all their obscurity. And because *our* desire is set *upon that*, and not upon bread or anything else, we remain with Thee.[1] His confession rises higher in the following words, since he knows thus much, and has just heard it repeated, that *faith in His own person* is the essential matter in the Lord's words. But he subjoins to his πεπιστεύκαμεν the ἐγνώκαμεν

[1] And he who thus purposes and thus remains, will go further than to the *words* of the Lord: he will enter into actual participation of Himself. It is matter of grief to us sometimes when we hear it boasted, with more than exegetical error, that the words of Jesus are pure spirit and truth.

also, since his faith is matter of clear consciousness; since he knows in whom he believes, and wherefore. The order may be found reversed elsewhere (as ch. x. 38; 1 Jno. iv. 16); but Peter designs here to testify that through a preparatory belief and reception of His words, even those which were full of mystery, they had attained to the height of their present knowledge of Christ. (Comp. ch. iv. 42.) For this was the main point in the contrast between them and those others, and this was the first element of separation. If the Text. Rec. were correct, the confession of Christ here uttered by Peter would go beyond those others in ch. i. 49, iv. 42, xi. 27, and be quite parallel with Matt. xvi. 16, and Thomas' words alone in ch. xx. 28 of St John's Gospel would go beyond them; we should then trace in the connection a very manifest emphasis upon the *τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος*, with significant allusion to the Lord's previous words in ver. 57.[1] Not merely is this latter addition, however, spurious, but most probably *ὁ Χριστὸς*, *ὁ υἱός* also; at least critics are almost unanimous in preferring *ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ*. We cannot, indeed, regard this latter as perfectly suitable in this place, where the sum and result of our Lord's words is given; and we may remark that neither Bengel nor Knapp decides for *ἅγιος*;[2] but we must abstain from the difficult attempt either to justify this *ἅγιος* by internal argument (which is not unnecessary, notwithstanding the result of all mere criticism, as long as probable various readings are on the other side), or to defend the propriety of rejecting it as in itself impossible. Our object is especially to unfold the words of Jesus.

Ver. 70. This heart-piercing question of the Redeemer, which proceeded from the deepest mystery of the will of His love in its condescending strife with the evil will of sinners, appertains, with all its tone of human gentleness and soft complaint, to the most *severe and rigorous* utterances of His lips. Its warning severity and force are surpassed only by its own intenser repetition at the last Supper—*One of you* will *betray* Me! When Peter utters his impetuous and well-meaning *we*, the Lord points to a

[1] Not, however, as Grotius supposed—Thou art the Son of God, and not, as the people said, the son of Joseph!

[2] Not Bengel, though he rejects the *ζῶντος*; but he thinks that the *υἱός* aptly corresponds with *πατρός μου* of ver. 65.

fearful exception from it; and that in the way of *question*, just as if the eleven might and should have known that all was not right and secure in their own circle. In fact they might have suspected it, at least, just as the Lord clearly saw it, if they had themselves been altogether pure, and sincere, and deeply-grounded in the truth. For that many a hypocritical evil-doer conceals himself from our detection, is the effect of human weakness in ourselves; but this infirmity is even in our case closely bound up with our sin, even though it be no sin itself; and even while it imposes upon us the obligation of charitably thinking the best of every one, until his iniquity become known to us. The Holy One of God could not be deceived by any sinner whatever; His heart-searching inquisition into the secret soul of man needed no miraculous intervention of Divine omniscience, but only the pure gaze of His single eye. That, therefore, the Apostles could have among them an undetected Judas, points of itself to the common sinful humanity inherent in them all; and the Lord's troubled words are a common warning to the whole circle, since in a certain sense He imputes the sin of one to the whole brotherhood, and reckons for it with them all. No other than this is the meaning of that awful, and still more piercing repetition of the words in the final, most confidential circle of love—One *of you!* It is as if the Lord should now say—Be ye all careful and humble, believers though ye are! It is not enough to have believed, and to have known; not enough to have remained with Me when others departed! The Betrayer and Destroyer insinuates himself into the narrowest circle, and most immediate fellowship with My person!

But the most piercing and mysterious words of all are His *direct utterance*, spoken after that which we have just mentioned had led the way to it in their silent comment. Even My *election* is not enough! It is very obvious that this ἐκλέγεσθαι has a different meaning from the same word in ch. xiii. 18, where Judas is specially indicated as *not* chosen; but we should greatly mistake if on that account we should *here* understand only the external calling and election of the Apostleship. The Son knows, like the Father, nothing of a mere external election unaccompanied by the earnest reality of love, which designs to save and accomplish all the purposes of a spiritual calling. This distinctive will

of *His own*, which manifested itself in the choice of Judas, the Lord mournfully *sets against* the self-procured fall of the One, the personal guilt of which that choice aggravated; what else does the connection indicate which binds the two sentences in one question? Is there not even among you twelve, all of whom I have alike chosen, One, whom that I know I must now tell you who know not, whose sin is only made worse by its opposition to My grace? *Consequently*—and this is the special purport of the question—Is there not a most critical and fearful danger connected with the keeping of the heart of man? Had I not cause to put the question to you all—*Will* ye also go away?

Alas, that Judas had gone too! This question mercifully points to him the way of departure, in which he would at least have been honest in his sin, like that prodigal in the parable, and with the same hope of an eventual return. But the hypocrisy of presumption, pride, and covetousness, which induced him to remain because he was one of the twelve, was a snare to him in which he became fast involved. It is shown, nevertheless, in him, as the most palpable example of human ruin and fall yet known in history, that there is in the Divine love, without prejudice to its prescience, an *election* of the *lost*. That the Lord can use, and does use the self-same word here and again in ch. xiii. 18 in such different meanings, exhibits to us the two aspects of a mystery, the dogmatic or speculative investigation of which does not belong to strict exegesis.[1] In protest against an invalidating interpretation of this ἐξελεξάμην we have only to put in juxtaposition with it ch. xvii. 12, in which this same lost Judas is at the same time enumerated among those who were *given by the Father*.

Finally, what is the signification of διάβολος here? Does the Lord actually term Judas *a devil* (as we read in Luther's Bible with the Vulg., as the Peschito has it סטנא, as even Stolz was obliged to translate it, and Seiler, with the qualification—he has devilish dispositions)—or are they right, who resolve the words into the general sense of *a secret traducer and adversary?*[2] Euthymius gives this latter as a second interpretation in connection with

[1] The mystery lies yet further back, even in Satan, who in his very creation was *chosen*.

[2] In a sense, therefore, synonymous with ὁ παραδώσων.

the first, ἐπίβουλος; and the later expositors, as we might have expected, give it the preference. Neander, with a most enfeebling exposition, paraphrases, "He had chosen them, drawn them to Himself, He says, and yet one of them had become possessed with the heart of an enemy!" It is, indeed, certain that as שָׂטָן in the Heb. admits of this more general signification, διάβολος is the prevalent Sept. translation of it, and that this Greek word is further used as the rendering of צַר and צוֹרֵר in Esth. vii. 4, viii. 1. (Comp. 1 Macc. i. 36, διάβολος πονηρός parallel with ἔνεδρος.) But the usage of the Greek Testament is another question. The Lexicographers must attach to the expression the additional idea of a proper opponent (adversarius); for, the *calumniator* of other passages is not altogether suitable here. We are ourselves of opinion that even those passages, as a whole, are to be understood *not without reference* to the devil. In any case Eph. iv. 27 and 1 Tim. iii. 6 must be excepted; there Satan proper is signified. In 1 Tim. iii. 11; 2 Tim. iii. 3; Tit. ii. 3, the general Greek signification comes, indeed, into the foreground; though not without allusion, assuredly, to the arch-slanderer, who has ever been so designated in the current language of Christians.[1] St John, finally, in his writings (and stress is laid upon this in other cases) uses the word διάβολος only for Satan. But Olshausen thinks this a decisive reason for translating it otherwise here, since the word is always used for "*the* devil," and never for "*a* devil."[2] I think otherwise. The passage must be regarded, in any case, as a ἅπαξ λεγόμενον, contrary to St John's usage, and that of the New Testament generally; whether the distinctive opponent be described with Wahl *adversarius;* or with Schöttgen, *homo diaboli similis.* If the Lord, not using the Greek, in all probability said *Satan,* He did not mean what we should designate as "*a* devil" (δαίμων, δαιμόνιον, hence St John did not thus render His word); but as parallel with such Old Testament passages as 2 Sam. xix. 22. He

[1] And even in the passage of Maccabees before alluded to the same thing is already found: see v. Meyer's corrected translation.

[2] But the same Olshausen, in his last volume on 2 Thess. ii. 3, returns to this passage, and says that Judas was among the disciples, what *the devil* is among the children of God. Thus Jno. xvii. 12 was too powerful for him, and caused him to forget his own exposition.

seemed to have called Peter Satan on one occasion; but we have given (Vol. ii.) another interpretation of that passage. And what a difference, at all events, between Peter's lapse into an instrument or minister of Satan against Christ, one solitary, undesigned instance, caused by the weakness of *flesh and blood*, and this attribution of a personal, persistent διάβολός ἐστι. St John, who only once has ὁ σατανᾶς (ch. xiii. 27), reserved this most personal expression for that consummation of the indwelling and influence of Satan in Judas; the word, according to Greek usage, would here have involved too unqualified, and absolute an identification.[1] As we understand our Lord's thoughts, He does not mean *merely* what otherwise would be τέκνον or υἱὸς διαβόλου (for that would be too slight and general for application to Judas, who was the *guide* and head of those who took Jesus), nor does He simply place him in parallel with any individual δαίμων or δαιμόνιον, but—One among you is *the Satan or devil in relation to Me*, that is, *his* elect instrument, *one who has fallen*, through a devilish spirit, into the ministry, and as it were, the *representation of the Devil.* How could this be better expressed in Greek (by St John or by Jesus Himself) than by this διάβολος, which, while hinting strongly at the article, yet naturally leaves it out?[2] This is the only interpretation which satisfies our feeling in a passage where emotion is pressed to its extremest point; to think of a mere adversary without reference to Satan appears to us insufferably bald. Lücke insists that "his relation to Jesus is much more significantly indicated, than the character and cause of the evil in him;" we cannot but think, however, that *both* are in the connection equally demanded in the exposition, and that both therefore are designed in their deepest unity by διάβολος. No other than Satanic counter-influence, that is, to which the heart had given place, could have first neutralised and then entirely overcome the grace of Christ ministered to one who had been chosen to be an Apostle; and then, again, one who, as such, had yielded himself up to Satan could not be otherwise than the most immediate instrument and representative of

[1] For σατανᾶς is a personal name, but διάβολος at the same time a designation of the office or spirit of that person.

[2] For γίνεται or ἐστί μοι εἷς διάβολον or σατανᾶν would be, on the other hand, not *personal* enough.

Satan *in relation to Christ;* and we think that the truth which lies in Lücke's requirement as to the relation of Judas to Christ in διάβολος, comes out with its strongest force in our view of the passage.[1] Only thus do we see the harmony between this first word of our Lord, which already penetrates the depths of the fulfilment of the fearful prophecy in Ps. cix., with the later expressions of the Apostles *derived from this* in Jno. xiii. 27; Lu. xxii. 3, with the Lord's own saying, Lu. xxii. 31 (Simon, Simon, Satan hath desired you all!), with the typical relation of Judas to Antichrist which is intimated in the parallel of Jno. xvii. 12, and 2 Thess. ii. 3. If we were to admit that the specific development of the sin, and its actual exhibition, in the *delivering Him up* to His enemies, came only before the Lord's actual contemplation with the approach of the time;[2] yet even then we must maintain, and all the more emphatically on that account, that the Holy One of God must have thus early most profoundly and searchingly pierced the hidden secret of Judas, the impending and already uprising *Satanity* of this *man.*[3] Not merely (as Neander says) that "the disposition which made him afterwards a traitor, betrayed itself to Him in its germ;" but that He contemplated beforehand in the germ and beginning the full consummation of the evil. Thus was this Judas daily and hourly before His eyes, a silent temptation—and in a very different sense from that in which Peter was so for a moment—to fall from the patience and enduring love of His appointed suffering for sin, by casting him out of His presence and judging him at once, whereas He was come to save and seek out with forgiving mercy that which was lost. This also our Lord acknowledges and

[1] Thus it might be translated, though not advisable, in the people's Bible—*is devil;* to be completed by—in My sight, and in relation to Me.

[2] As Lücke suggests, the Lord Himself does not here term Judas παραδώσων, but it is the reflection of the Evangelist ex eventu.

[3] We discover here that there is such a thing possible to humanity, even as there is a *divinity* possible (though not in the sense of the Graser Erziehungsprinzips)! Judas himself, indeed, was not yet "altogether satanized" (as Boss in his Satanologie rightly remarks), for he was moved by a final *remorse;* but it is saying too much, though even Luther declares it, that man may never become devil. The repentance of Judas was his last of humanity, presently afterwards the devil in him was consummated by his daring self-murder.

bewails in that fearful ἐξ ὑμῶν εἷς διάβολός ἐστιν—the profundity of which we cannot deem exhausted by any exposition of a mere *insidiator* or *adversarius*.

TO HIS UNBELIEVING BRETHREN: MY TIME AND MY WAY ARE NOT YOURS.

(Chap. vii. 6–8.)

An observation of Oetinger upon this place is as simple as it is profound, and must not be lost sight of in any attempt to discern the system of St John's Gospel:—"I assuredly believe that John wrote the first ten chapters of his gospel with reference to his three fundamental points:—1. of word, 2. of life, and 3. of light."[1] Nothing is more evident than that chaps. i.–iii., following the Prologue, continue the idea of *testimony*, which turns now from the Baptist altogether to Christ, see chap. iii. 11, 32. The stages of this trichotomy, however, pass naturally one into the other. Ὁ λέγων σοι, chap. iv. 10, λαλῶν σοι, ver. 26, as the answer to the woman's ἀναγγελεῖ ἡμῖν πάντα place distinctively before our eyes the λόγος (chap. i. 18, ἐκεῖνος ἐξηγήσατο), and chap. v. then completes the idea of *His witness to Himself:* yet these chapters iv. and v. pass over, as we have seen, into the second idea—in Him is *life*. This again is superabundantly brought out in the sixth chapter, where not only the words of the Eternal Speaker discourse of eternal life, but the σάρξ of the Incarnate One is announced as πνεῦμα καὶ ζωή. But Oetinger overlooks what we have just hinted, when he says: "Chaps. vi. and vii. refer to the *life*, as is evident in every verse; chaps. viii., ix., and x., passing then manifestly to the *light*." For chap. vii.

[1] See Oetinger's Selbstbiographie, herausg. von Hamberger. Stuttg. 1845, S. 52, and compare Auberlen, die Theosophie Oetingers, S. 409, as also Oetinger's Theologie nach der Idee des Lebens, herausg. von Hamberger, S. 106. The characteristically bold assertion of Baumgarten-Crusius "that the Prologue is not echoed in the gospel itself" (i. 368) must be entirely reversed. The Prologue is no other than a pre-intimation of the contents of the whole Gospel.

forms already, as before, the transition from life to *light;* and that by bringing into prominence the sufficiently prepared for requirement of *faith* in Him who manifests Himself to the world,—manifests Himself, however, now, His full ὕψωσις and φανέρωσις being yet in the future, in a manner which the darkness of the world cannot apprehend, ὡς ἐν κρυπτῷ ver. 10. Let chap. vii. 33, 34 be compared with chap. xii. 35, 36. And once more let note be taken of the reference made in chap. vii. 39, as throughout all the stages of the entire Gospel, to the future consummate glorification of Jesus.

In the whole of chaps. vii., viii., ix., x., Jesus (as the Light of the world, chap. viii. 12) bears a testimony more and more definite to Himself that He was sent from God His Father into the world for its salvation, and that He Himself was one in dignity with the Father who sent Him: bearing this testimony by word and deed during the feasts of Tabernacles and of the Dedication at Jerusalem, that is, in the very midst of His enemies, who could not lay hands on Him before His hour was come. As His discourse proceeds at the feast of Tabernacles, faith or unbelief in Him as the Christ becomes more and more sharply defined. Upon a following day, and occasioned by the circumstance of the adulteress which put the Pharisees especially to shame, a second discourse is appended to that of ch. vii., in which He defends His testimony to Himself in all the depth and fulness of its meaning, and most severely condemns His enemies' sin and unbelief. The result of this light shining in the darkness is—the attempt to stone Him! (Ch. viii. 59.) Finally, chaps. ix. and x. give together the last great testimony of Jesus to Himself as the *light*, in which only they who are blind see, those who see becoming blind: a testimony of *word* which hangs upon that incontrovertible though rejected testimony of *deed*, in the healing of the man born blind.

This main section of the Gospel thus viewed—a section to which Luthardt, upon his arrangement also, gives the title of "conflict with unbelief"—is *introduced* by the record of the desire on the part of His *unbelieving* and vain brethren that He should *prematurely* and in *their* way *show Himself to the world*, with His reply to them in word and act. We would have the profound harmony and fitness of this circumstance in this place

deeply pondered by those who understand the principle of true criticism, that the more plainly in any *historical writing* a *plan of the matter* is evident, the more certainly is that writing legitimated as *true history.* And where should we expect this principle to operate in its fullest degree, but in the history of our Lord, which is throughout in its every incident full of significance, pervaded by a typical reference, and in its continuous course most perfectly "real-ideal?"

It will be seen by a reference to our tabular harmony in the third volume, in what way we arrange the Galilæan incidents and discourses which St John passes over, and that we do not, with many, identify this feast journey of our Evangelist with that of Luke ix. 51. We find in the intimation here given of a persistent and increasing enmity directed against Him, a hint for the interpretation of all that follows. He Himself clearly knew from the beginning His time, and goal, and course; but—"none else can comprehend Him, no man can apprehend His hour, neither His brethren, nor the people." We have elsewhere asserted our view, and cannot now of course reopen the question, that these *brethren* are—contrary to all catholic tradition, and much Protestant criticism—no other than brethren who belong to Mary, being always found in her company; that is, her sons born afterwards to her who continued in a not unblessed marriage with Joseph.[1]

[1] The immature treatise in the first collection of my Andeutungen—written in my twenty-third year—has been condensed in my Expos. of the Ep. of Jude (Berlin W. Hertz. 1850), and the argument still more strongly enforced that they were the sons of Mary. We regard this result as established, after so many dissertations, especially through those of Blom, Wieseler, and Schaff. The latter alone has done my treatise the honour to refer to it, although he (S. 8 of his essay on James) has not noticed the postscript in which I corrected the error in connection with the μετά of Hegesippus. Whether James was one of these brethren, does not affect the matter; though I have not yet been convinced of the contrary. Thiersch still agrees with the Greek church that they were brethren of Joseph's former marriage (as Nonnus, Jno. vii. 3 without scruple interpolates υἷες Ἰωσήφ); but in opposition to this I have only to repeat my former words, that it is less disparagement to the divine dignity of the whole procedure to assume the subsequent fruitfulness—required, too, on other grounds—of the marriage planned and confirmed of God between Joseph and Mary, than to regard the holy virgin as espoused to a widower with sons and daughters.

We must not, however, leave this subject without most earnestly protesting against Lange's recent view that the brethren who here appear as unbelievers were even *Apostles*. In John ii. 12 these same brethren are with their mother, and distinguished from the *disciples*, as they distinguish themselves here from the μαθηταῖς. Lange endeavours to invalidate the simple and plain words of the Evangelist—*Neither* did his *brethren* believe in Him (which are themselves the strongest argument against the signification "cousins," since *one* such συγγενής or ἀνεψιός was an Apostle), by asserting that they are only to be "unbelieving in a higher sense;"[1] but this we find it impossible to admit with any regard to the context. For the unbelief of the brethren so perfectly stamps their words, and, more than that, the Lord's answer so sharply repels them, placing Himself in direct *opposition* to them, and classing them so clearly with the world, that we cannot understand how any one—duly weighing the latter fact especially—can think of Apostles in this case! Assuredly, if faith may be asserted of a mere conviction or sentiment of the intellect (though St John never so represents it), then were these brethren not absolutely unbelievers, for they presuppose in Jesus the power of ταῦτα ποιεῖν and of φανεροῦν ἑαυτόν, and only wish to impel Him to a public declaration of Himself. But inasmuch as they—whether disciples or not—would make all depend upon an external exhibition to the world, and a brilliant success among men, without any trust of the heart, without any apprehension of the true, the divine in Him, and without any respect for the sufficient demonstration He had already given, they place themselves on a level with Gamaliel, at least, as unbelievers. When, not without an admixture of taunt, they challenge Him to make public proof of His claims, their unbelief may fairly be denominated unfriendly and even hostile. The words which we find in the typical prophecy, Ps. lxix. 8, correspond with wonderful exactness to the relation be-

[1] Dr Kuhn also, who maintains the argument against their being literal brethren, attributes to the πιστεύειν of our passage only a "special sense." (Jahrb. für Theol. u. christl. Philos. 1834, 3.) Lange has allowed himself more recently to speak of a transitionally expressed unbelief, and of an obscuration of mind and feeling, but most obviously in opposition to the plain tenor of the text. (Leben Jesu iii. 567, 591, 610.)

tween Jesus and these brethren—I am become a *stranger* unto My brethren, and an alien unto *My mother's children.*

Jesus had not gone up to Jerusalem, either at the Passover or at the Pentecost; Galilee was the scene of His labour, Capernaum His Jerusalem: so now He makes no preparation to go up to the feast of Tabernacles. They cannot understand this, any more than the whole course of His general conduct. And they speak to Him in their ancient familiar and confident tone—that to which they had been accustomed in their family dwelling—Now, O brother, if Thou art actually the Messiah (we wait to know more about this, that we may understand the honour which will thence ensue to us), be at length in good earnest, and show Thyself! The impatience of their vanity impels them to utter the challenge in a manner somewhat *taunting*, the tone of which cannot fail to be caught by every unprejudiced mind. (Not, however, *mockingly*, as Klee much too strongly asserts.) Their boldness already breaks out in the unqualified imperative—*μετάβηθι ἐντεῦθεν*: in such a style none assuredly would have ventured to speak to Him, but those who had grown up with Him and had been accustomed to use it. (It is altogether unimaginable that this could have taken place in the circle of His Apostles; the saying of Peter, Matt. xvi. 22, admit of no comparison, and we should be ashamed to waste words upon it.) Let *Thy disciples* (among whom *we* do not yet reckon ourselves!) behold the works which Thou doest—they mean especially the followers whom our Lord had won in Judæa, and even in Jerusalem, whom He should take care of in order that His interest might advance, and independently of whom they esteemed His Galilæan followers of slight account. Their words, however, assume at the same time that even these Galilæan dependents would not be contented with His Galilæan exhibition, unless He could legitimate His pretensions with becoming dignity in the great capital. Their ideas of the Messiah had made the Nazarene brothers of this presumptive Messiah so full of the lofty Jewish feeling, that they despise their own Galilee in this *ἐντεῦθεν*, with something of the same spirit in which the Rulers afterwards spoke, ver. 52.

In ver. 4 *τί* before *ποιεῖ* has a certain emphasis; it does not *here* refer to any slight matter, but such things as their brother

contemplated and purposed to do; this, however, lies in the subject itself, and it is not necessary that we should resort to any special signification of the Greek τί in connection with ἔχειν, εἶναι, ποιεῖν. The καί is certainly not a Hebraism (as Grotius has it) for אֲשֶׁר, but as a *nevertheless* expresses their sense of the self-contradiction in which the conduct of Jesus seemed to them to be involved—purposing and willing to do some great thing, and yet keeping *His person* in the background, instead of going boldly forward to the critical scene of accomplishment. A *political* meaning their brethren do not seem to have, but they express honestly the first and most obvious principle upon which this vain world acts—He who will be anything must go forward openly and boldly to dare it! With *such a* measure do they mete Him! The καὶ αὐτός, although its meaning is otherwise obvious enough, we do not regard with Lücke as merely *idemque*, indicating the self-contradiction in the strongest manner, but we agree with Kling and Baumgarten-Crusius that there is also an opposition intended between the questionable τί ποιεῖν and the *personal appearance* necessary in order to it. It thus fully corresponds with the φανέρωσον σεαυτόν, in which the pith of the whole finally lies. The εἰ has obviously, as we have before observed, an undertone in it of derision, or if that be too strong, of hesitating doubt. For we cannot apprehend ταῦτα ποιεῖς to mean—Is that Thy design, wilt Thou be the light of the world? but they designate by this expression (as Lücke rightly says), "His then present operation in Galilee," the same which they have already disparagingly referred to as ἐν κρυπτῷ ποιεῖν, and now again still more strongly doubt of and question by this εἰ. Thus it is not—*Since* Thou doest such things (ἔργα ver. 3), or *canst* do such things;[1] but—*If* what we hear concerning Thy miracles be actually true.[2] In this contrast ἐν παῤῥησίᾳ answers plainly enough to ἐν κρυπτῷ; and it is quite unnecessary to adduce the Rabbinical usage which, retaining the Greek word, employed it in the sense of *celebrity*. The words here in con-

[1] Grotius: ποιεῖν hic potestatem perpetuam faciendi significat. Si potes, inquiunt, et ubi et quoties vis talia facere.

[2] As we apprehend in Nonnus: εἰ τάδε ῥέξεις ποικίλα θαύματα. The Evangelist John thus presupposes in this ταῦτα, that Jesus had wrought many wonderful works in *Galilee*, which he has not recorded.

nection with *αὐτός*, go beyond the ordinary idea, and express the sense of the speakers to be, as Hezel puts it, "play a public part," show Thyself unrestrainedly, place Thyself boldly forward (not simply as yet *διαφημίζεσθαι*). This is the mistaken prejudice which preoccupies their minds; they apprehend the Messiah's work after a worldly fashion, and would precipitate it in the spirit of Isa. v. 19; for the same world which, according to ch. iii. 20, hateth the light in the best sense, seeks it in another and worse sense with ignorant hardihood, and lays the utmost stress upon *publicity*. Kling remarks, with as much point as truth, that the brethren use the expression *τῷ κοσμῷ* with a certain "appropriation of the language of the disciples;" though this appropriation is at the same time ironical and blind. Hence the Lord must at once proceed to open their eyes that they may know what the *world* properly is, and what is His relation to it.

His answer is just as gentle as we might have expected it would be to His own peculiar brethren; but it is also just as severe as such persistent unbelief among those so near Him demanded. The gentleness consists in this, that He not only meekly accepts the direction to depart, but condescends to justify Himself by giving them information of His reasons; the severity further appears, in that He does this only by placing His own manner of acting and theirs in direct and irreconcilable contrast. They will not be His *μαθηταί*, He therefore classes them with the world of which they had ignorantly spoken. My *time* is other than yours; that is, at the same time, My manner of acting, My whole relations. We see in the *πάντοτε* of the contrast that the Lord proceeds from the first sense of the appropriate, appointed time of departure for the feast, to a more general and absolute sense of the word *καιρός*. His brethren, like all men of the world, as long as they remain such, have, alas, no higher reference, no higher guidance, no great restrictions in their *ποιεῖν* and *ζητεῖν*, and therefore all that may be understood by *καιρός* in relation to their acts, is utterly indifferent to them; they may *always* do what their heart listeth in its folly, the folly wherewith they imagine to themselves that they may make their own time. But when, on the other hand, the Lord speaks of His own time, He refers to that high Divine appointment and

guidance which beforehand disposed of every single circumstance, for the sake of the great, final object of His life. Just as in chap. ii. 4, He passed, in a similar expression, from the immediate and obvious matter before Him, to the great futurity, so is it here. Indeed, in the present instance the reference is more certain and more distinct, inasmuch as His brethren have desired His departure to the feast as the means of bringing nearer the object of His life. We may say in a certain sense with Bengel, that in ver. 6 He is speaking more directly of the feast, and in ver. 8 proceeds to refer it to His sufferings and death: this requires qualification, however, inasmuch as the first already passed over into the second. What is it that the brethren wish? That He should show Himself to the world! Now in *their* sense He came not *for this;* the world *as such* neither did nor should know and acknowledge Him down to the end, see ch. xiv. 17, 21, 22. In order, however, that He may not utterly repel them, but as far as possible give them instruction, He mysteriously attaches His words to theirs, substitutes, however, His own sense, the only correct one, of the public exhibition which they demanded,—and according to that meaning His death in His manifestation. His enemies may not lay hands upon Him until His Father wills (see presently chap. vii. 30)—but He also for Himself may not and will not receive the greetings of His followers consequent upon His public, tumultuous, entrance into Jerusalem; He will not receive their Hosannahs as Messiah, and deliver Himself into the power of His enemies, until His Father should say to Him—The hour is come! Consequently His time for public procession to the feast, and His hour of passion, which here coincide, was not yet come; though the brethren in another sense imagined that the time had come for His entrance on His glory and honour. In the second clause we should at first have expected only—But your time, that is, the time which you falsely suppose to be Mine. Instead of this, the Lord proceeds at once to a perfect separation between Himself and them, as a matter that would be immediately understood of itself. They excluded themselves from the circle of discipleship, partly in irony and partly as pledging their homage when His claims were authenticated; but He repels them from Him with the deep sorrow of earnest truth—We have nothing now in common! The

expression ἕτοιμος, parallel with πάρεστιν, is translated rightly by Meyer—*vorhanden*, present, now.[1] Nothing hinders or limits you; for you have not to measure your steps after the counsel of God, and in the presence of an angry and persecuting world.

If it was in their desire to become celebrated with their brother, His immediate intimation must have overturned all their foolish speculations:—"From Me, as My disciples, ye have nothing to expect but the hatred of the world; that is the law and the rule of My kingdom. Ye spake of *the world;* and meant by that the whole multitude of the people with their rulers: but I say unto you that ye yet know not what the world is, though ye belong to it, and are also its fast friends." It is a word of keen condemnation, when the Lord says to any one—The world *cannot* hate you, it leaves you in peace as you leave it! And it was with the deepest grief of heart that He felt Himself constrained thus to speak to His own brethren after the flesh. When, on the other hand, He described Himself as hated of the world, and gave as a reason of it His testimony against its evil works, He told them indirectly, though plainly enough, *what* it was that He sought, *what* He designed to do, and that (as Fikenscher says) "faith in Him had nothing to do with the world's notoriety and consideration." Thus He speaks as the *Light* which was hated of the world (ch. iii. 20), as He whose aim was not so much to come to the light Himself, as to shed His own light upon the world for *its* revelation, to give His testimony as graciously, and yet as prudently as might be, until the hour should come when He should for the first time and finally succumb to its hatred.

The concluding verse, as a well-founded consequence, gives them back for their μετάβηθι His ὑμεῖς ἀνάβητε. The *first* ταύτην may not be genuine, but that is of little significance: the various reading οὔπω for οὐκ is more important. The former stands in Lachmann's text, but it can be scarcely regarded as the true reading; it would not have been easily substituted by οὐκ, whereas it was very natural to qualify the difficult and harsh οὐκ, by changing it for οὔπω. Porphyry could not have alleged against the Lord the imputation, if not of falsehood yet

[1] Bengel, on the contrary,—fitted for you, and Stolz—appointed; but these are already involved in the καιρός.

of *inconstantia*, if he had read οὔπω. Nor is this latter so suitable to the words, which, with designed indefiniteness, *repel* the brethren and send them on their way alone, as to the following οὔπω πεπλήρωται, which gives a *reason* for His οὐκ ἀναβαίνω. This οὔπω πεπλήρωται does not, as it were, intimate (according to Lange) that He will presently follow; for in the prudent design of the Lord His brethren were not to know this, that they might not herald His coming and excite expectation. But the πεπλήρωται rather points, according to the Lord's usual language, more strongly than before to the *sense* in which He speaks of His prescribed time and hour, and its coming. It is altogether another thing, and quite consistent with it, that the Lord in His own mind intended His οὐκ for οὔπω; which it has been unskilfully sought to intimate by substituting this reading, or by the addition of νῦν, thus obviating every appearance of untruthfulness in His words. But this appearance does not exist in them, if we only allow the Lord to speak as a man with the prudence with which we may and must ourselves often speak in such circumstances.[1] For the brethren it was perfectly true, that He was not going to set forth with them, and, therefore, in the way which they desired; what He designed to do afterwards was a matter for His own thoughts alone. His word would have been untruthful then only if He had used, instead of the observable ἀναβαίνω, the future ἀναβήσω. Such mental reservation as this is unavoidable, if we would speak to the world wisely, according to Solomon's rule, Prov. xxix. 11. It is an idle and unbecoming subtilty, to which the ancients, and Bengel, and now again Lange resort, which would make a great distinction between the declaration—I go not with you upon the Festal journey, and—I shall not during the feast go to Jerusalem. For it is not true, that His going up might have been regarded as subsequent to the feast, just as the Greeks might go; His secret going up was after all, as the Evangelist himself says in ver. 10, an ἀναβαίνειν εἰς τὴν ἑορτὴν ταύτην; and the more obviously so, as He afterwards, in ver. 37, on the great day of the feast, utters

[1] "There is only one passage which has ever been adduced as bearing the appearance of attributing untruth to our Saviour—Jno. vii. 8. But an untruth cannot be detected here in any sense (even if οὐκ is the right reading). Rothe, Ethik. iii. 575.

His testimony with express allusion to the customs of the feast.[1]

Enough, that He would not on this occasion go more φανερῶς in the procession, that is, not in the company of His unbelieving and vain brethren; but He went up ὡς ἐν κρυπτῷ, by which St John affirms the conduct blamed by the brethren as the wise procedure of His counsel; and the ὡς (a rather *strengthening* than qualifying addition) intimates—that He had the appearance *as if He were actually* one who in distrust of His work must withdraw His own person from observation! The Gospel will in due time abundantly explain the paradox of this temporary incognito of the Lord of glory and the King of truth. Whether, moreover, the Twelve, whom we find in ch. ix. 2 surrounding Him as ever, went up with Him in secrecy, is a question which we may ask without any certain answer; it *might* indeed have been that at this time He sent them also forward before Him, and that this fact is contained also in the οὐ φανερῶς.

AT THE FEAST OF TABERNACLES; FIRST GREAT CONVERSATION WITH THE JEWS. MY DOCTRINE IS FROM GOD; CIRCUMCISION AND HEALING ON THE SABBATH; YE KNOW WHENCE I AM!

(Ch. vii. 16–29.)

Thus must we comprise together *three* discourses of our Lord at the feast of Tabernacles, which, proceeding through interruptions, form one connected conversation, the *first great colloquy* with the Jews in the temple, both rulers and people. He therein testifies, induced on each point by some especial circumstance, the Divine origin of His *words* and of His *works;* appeals, in order to excite faith in the former, to that witness of inward experience which will be afforded to every one who willeth to do

[1] Another view (as we find it lately reproduced in Sepp) thus explains it—that He did not at first actually purpose to go, but that He afterwards subdued His own inclination in order to do His Father's will. Which, nevertheless, is not intimated.

the will of God, as well as to the external evidence which was to be found in His humility; defends the propriety in particular of His last Sabbath-miracle by analogy drawn from the law; demands a right judgment; reproves the unbelievers while He detects to them their wicked plots and their judicial ignorance of God. All being clear confirmation of what He had before said to His brethren concerning His own witness and the world's hatred.

They *seek* Him, generally, at the feast in Jerusalem (as ch. xi. 56)—though with very various spirit, for all minds are excited, whether for Him or against Him. Among the common people there yet lingers at least some doubt, but the rulers are decided and have decreed against Him. Hence there is no more than a secret murmuring, for no one ventures to speak openly and freely in His favour. The Ἰουδαῖοι, ver. 13, might have been the inhabitants of Judæa, ver. 1, or the Jewish people generally as in ver. 2; we should then have to make the distinction afterwards between the people in general specially intended in ver. 12, and the rulers in particular, ver. 13. Yet certainly the Galilæan followers of our Lord, who have come to the feast, are included in the ὄχλοι; and after the phraseology of the entire chapter we should more correctly regard the Ἰουδαίους as the leaders and rulers of the people, the ἄρχοντες, ver. 26, as first in ver. 1, and again in ver. 13. Their ζητεῖν is consequently an obviously unfriendly search, as in ver. 1; though we must not press it so far as Hezel does—"they commanded Him to be sought out, and sent spies to take Him, in order that they might place Him in durance." For the public inquiry ποῦ ἐστιν ἐκεῖνος, seems to indicate something different from this. By this expression the Evangelist, having set out with the malicious question of the enemies, *passes over* to the more general inquiry and curiosity concerning the accustomed chief stranger at the feast. Thus the following verse is not to be regarded with Lampe as "*an effect* of this inquiry," but as a continued description of the state of things in the metropolis, that no man, enemy or friend, remained indifferent, every one thought of Him. Every one knew without mentioning His name who this ἐκεῖνος was, and all miss Him, and feel His absence. Euthymius took the word to be a scornful one (as in Matt. xxvii. 63),

spoken διὰ τὸ μῖσος; we cannot go so far, but think that, whether in scorn or in pretence, the enemies themselves spoke in lofty terms concerning Him—Where is the celebrated man, the great Prophet, abiding?[1]

This simple question issuing from His enemies, awakens into expression the doubts which existed concerning Him, among the common people—comp. ch. ix. 16, x. 19–21. His friends only venture to utter, indefinitely and timidly enough, their slightly defensive ἀγαθός, which we do not interpret, with Baumgarten Crusius,—A benevolent, friendly, well-wisher of the people; but with Von Gerlach, following the Hirschberger Bibel—An honourable and true man.[2] This was saying but little in itself, yet as a protest against the charges brought against Him, it was much. Listening hypocrites, speaking well of Jesus, in order to sound His disposition, are not to be thought of among the ὄχλοις, and after the parallels which we have referred to. The accusers betray by their τὸν ὄχλον that they speak as taking the position of the rulers, and speaking on their side. *These* speak openly enough, and the following clause does not intend to signify that *all* speech about Him, whether for or against, was only a γογγυσμὸς, for we only can be said to speak παῤῥησίᾳ as it regards the unsuppressed feeling of the heart. *For* Him no man ventured to speak openly for fear of men; and Schleiermacher preaches well upon this text against the "most culpable weakness and guilt of the people around Him in our Lord's days." The people who were attached to Him feared the Jews (comp. chap. ix. 22); even as His enemies again feared the people when they would carry into execution their ζητεῖν ἀποκτεῖναι, Matt. xxi. 46.

Into the midst of this mutually restrained ζητεῖν καὶ γογγύζειν our Lord suddenly and unexpectedly entered, as fearless as prudent. Τῆς ἑορτῆς μεσούσης (Vulg. with precision die festo mediante) does not necessarily mean the fourth day of the festal week, but, generally, during the interval between the high fes-

[1] As Lampe quotes Gualther: Non tam contemtim, quam invidiose. Ubi tandem latet ille magnificus suarum virtutum ostentator—? Cur non nunc prodit in publicum?

[2] There is no question but that it may mean this. Yet in Neh. vii. 2, which has been referred to, the LXX. read ἀληθής for אִישׁ אֱמֶת.

tivities of the first and last day. The sudden and unexpected appearance, manifesting the utmost confidence in them, gave Him for a while the protection of the surrounding people; for He wisely chooses the time of His working, neither precipitately involving Himself in danger, nor holding back with undignified caution. Fikenscher imagines that His appearance had something of a miraculous character, considering the shortness of the time since His later departure from Galilee; but this we leave altogether undecided. Suffice, that He appears in the temple, and takes His place in one of the side-rooms appointed for the purpose, and began as usual to *teach*. That is, on this occasion and at first, without any direct personal witness, but, as it were, with the general design to expound the Scripture. The Jews *marvelled*, which must ever be the first influence when He speaks. The θαυμάζειν does not imply, as Lange and many others have imposed their meaning upon it, that they contested His right openly to teach, and charged Him with presumption before the people;[1] that would have been expressed in a very different way. Certainly we must not suppose, further, with Lampe, that this was the first time of His entering the temple! No, even these Jews are constrained to bear involuntary testimony to His wisdom, though they afterwards, like those at Nazareth, give it an invidious turn, by their malicious question as to *whence* He obtained it; while their conclusion in reality destroys their premises, and the true answer is contained in the question itself. "The supposition that man can learn only from man" is not merely, as some one has said, a "Galilæan folly," but a Jewish one also, as we here find, and it is, indeed, the common prejudice of the learned. "How is it then that ye good people have never known, that there are many things which a man must not have learned, in order to know them otherwise than if they had been learned!" (Kleuker.) *Learning*, that is, according to the signification which it bears here, and which it ordinarily bears, that of the human school and accustomed discipline of learning, such as was common in the Lord's days.[2] That Jesus

[1] Neander: Not being trained He was not justified in undertaking public instruction. Brückner: A new method of stirring up enmity against Jesus, His qualification to instruct being impeached.

[2] Nonnus quite correctly: ἴδμονι τέχνῃ.

had undergone no such scholastic discipline, and that this was generally known and admitted, is a very important testimony, or "biographical datum." How, and in what way, the Son had indeed *learned*, is not a question which we can enter upon now.

Luther's translation—Wie kann dieser *die Schrift?* How knoweth this man *the Scripture?* has been needlessly corrected. Lücke thinks, and Lange confidently follows him, that γράμματα, without ἱερά, could signify only letters or literature, learning, as in Acts xxvi. 24. Others regard this as settled by the absence of the article, which, however, determines nothing. Bengel in his German New Testament has it—How is this *a learned man*, having never yet *learned?* And Fikenscher, too, feels constrained to translate—the sciences, like the Vulg. *literas.* If, however, the μεμαθηκώς might seem to include a reference to this more general sense, it yet remains quite certain that among the Jews learning in general and Scriptural learning were one and the same (Acts xxvi. says nothing against this, see ver. 22) —the Lord had certainly not given in the temple any "specimens of erudition," but a most surprising and simply profound understanding of Scripture; and, finally, the Evangelist himself, ch. v. 47, uses γράμματα for the writings of Moses. Consequently Luther may be quite right, in company with the Peschito, which has translated it by סְפָרָא (the Book). And the son of Sirach knew no other σοφιά, wisdom or science, than that of a γραμματεύς, and desires for its cultivation leisure from every other avocation, the freedom from business in order to exercise himself continually, exercise such as πᾶς τέκτων applies to his own craft, Ecclus. xxxviii. 24–27. That is, indeed, the human rule and requirement for every one of us; yet there are exceptions to it even among ourselves, and it is a mischievous prejudice, which has been too much fostered by the monopolising learned, that learning is essentially necessary for such a believing comprehension of the word of God as suffices to obtain the kingdom of heaven. *Against that* the Lord's word now testifies, inasmuch as He not only refers back His own doctrine to the revelation of the Father (which, indeed, was for Him in another sense the school of human *learning*), but also at the same time indicates to every sincere follower the internal, practical way to the only true apprehension of the same doctrine.

Ver. 16. What our Lord elsewhere terms His words, His word, or testimony, He *this once* designates by the expression διδαχὴ: taking occasion to do this, in order that He may thus meekly place Himself on a level with all other διδάσκοντες and διδάσκαλοι, when διδαχή is spoken of according to its contents, and system, and method. When in the well-known passages of the synoptics, which, indeed, are not strictly analogous or parallel with this in St John, we find astonishment excited by His διδαχή (Matt. vii. 28, xxii. 33; Mar. i. 22, 27, xi. 18; Lu. iv. 32); when (Jno. xviii. 19) Annas inquires concerning the διδαχή of Jesus; and the disciples, Matt. xvi. 12, are warned to beware of the διδαχή of the Pharisees—the word is to be taken in the same sense according to which the Lord's teaching is placed among the manifold doctrinal systems and διδασκαλίαι, Matt. xv. 9, of the day. Thus He enters into the midst of the *teachers* and says —ἡ ἐμὴ διδαχή. But in the same breath He places His doctrine in direct antithesis to all that might be called ἐντάλματα or θεωρήματα ἀνθρώπων—οὐκ ἔστιν ἐμή, is *not Mine.* We may say that this paradox not only exhibits to us the origin, but has reference to the *substance* of His teaching, its most essential and specific subject and theme. For now that πίστις has become again a γνῶσις, and Christianity a system of *doctrine*, it cannot be too emphatically or too persistently inculcated that the Lord Jesus teaches *no new thing* in the world: He neither gives to the heathen philosophers new theorems as such, nor to the Jewish Scripture-wisdom altogether new precepts, promises, and revelations. The *new* in His doctrine, that which indeed makes all new, consists in this, that He testifies Himself to be in *His own person* the *Fulfilment* of the entire Old Testament, and *His kingdom* to be the *realisation* of all right knowledge and true desire in the whole world.[1] From the first appeal to the old law of love made new in Him, to the predictions of the last things, in which He only seals and confirms and closes the ancient prophecies; and through the entire circle of that revelation of human and Divine things with which He responds to the seeking, questioning speculation of the heathens, big with the word and notion, but never bringing forth the thing and the reality—

[1] Dietlein in his writings against the school of Baur maintains and develops this most excellently.

everywhere and throughout all there is the one great—*I am He!* Thus far His doctrine is one with Himself, and the acceptation of that is one with the πιστεύειν in His ἐγώ εἰμι. (Ch. viii. 24.) As in ch. viii. 26, 28 He says before the Jews, and as in ch. xiv. 24 He says before the disciples, so He says now here—That which I speak, and teach, and testify, I speak under the commission, and by the authority of the Father *who hath sent Me.* He is indeed as the speaker no other than that great *Prophet* promised in Deut. xviii., but only again as the only-begotten of the Father, to whom alone the words of God are given in an essential, pre-eminent, and exclusive sense:—hence all other prophets and speakers in the name of God were only imperfect types and forerunners of this true Prophet. If the Jews had never considered and applied in this case that which held good with regard to the old prophets—Who is his father or his master? (1 Sam. x. 12, comp. Amos vii. 14, 15), but desired only a μανθάνειν after a human manner, then is the Lord's answer most abundantly decisive:—So little is *My* doctrine derived from human instruction, and learned humanly by Myself, that it is not in any sense according to your notions the product of My own study, investigation, or thought—but no other than the revelation to My mind of Him who sendeth Me to speak to you, and Himself speaketh in Me and by Me.

Ver. 17. He who is of God, heareth and understandeth the words of God; he who is of the truth, discerns and accepts all that which the personal Truth Himself brings to man and speaks as the fulfilment and realisation of all those truths which were extant among men before His final testimony came. For this no such learning is necessary as can be acquired only within the limits of the school, or by the hard discipline of study; the Father revealeth it to the babes who are willing to learn of His Son, to learn for the direction of life and action, and for their righteousness as sinners before God. That which was long ago expressed by Sirach's son (Ecclus. xxi. 12)—He that keepeth the law of the Lord, getteth the understanding thereof (ὁ φυλάσσων νόμον κατακρατεῖ τοῦ ἐννοήματος αὐτοῦ, καὶ συντέλεια τοῦ φόβου κυρίου σοφία, according to the ancient word in Job xxviii. 28)—finds in this utterance of Jesus its full and most distinctive expression. Here does the Lord protest against the πρῶτον

ψεῦδος of all learning, gnosis, philosophy, speculation of presumptuous and blind men; and assures us that there is no such thing, nor can be, as pure thought, no such investigation as is independent of the heart's disposition and the will's direction, at least in regard to His doctrine, and the things which pertain to the will and revelation of God. He sets out with that position which Schiller once so scornfully repelled as "ins Gewissen schieben"—"the laying it all on the conscience," and admits no other evidence than that a posteriori, springing from an inward moral experience, where alone is the veritatis cum *pietate* vinculum. It is the *will* of man which is concerned, there lies the lack and the hindrance; faith, and progressive knowledge in believing, is also an act, springing from the sincere *willing* to do the Divine will; unbelief and the ignorance which follows it, is a crime to be reckoned against those who love and who work a lie. Oh that this catechumen-word could pervade even our orthodox theological science, so that our μεμαθηκότες might first come to that *true* γράμματα εἰδέναι which coincides with the "hermeneutics of the New Testament writers" as taught by Jesus, and then arrive at the true "teaching with authority" for others! The Lord does not say at the end of His testimony—Ye *have* not understood Me, or apprehended My meaning; but—Ye *would* not! Where, however, the ἐάν τις θέλῃ is at one with the θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ, a sure, and inexhaustibly increasing γνώσεται is promised.

But what is this *will of God*, which the Lord assumes to be already known to every one to whom He proposes His own *doctrine?* There must indeed be a manifest criterion for this recommended criticism of Divine revelation. The doctrine of Christ does not present itself to the world and the human heart unprepared for and unmediated. And His own saying incontrovertibly attests that He does not demand a blind submission to it as an absolute παράδοξον and θαῦμα—true knowledge never could come in this way. Thus when the old dogmatic finds in it at once only the promised internal testimony of the Holy Spirit,[1] and then in a strange circle which must always

[1] As Ebrard also incautiously writes, "but they should first seek to do *what He says.*" And Theremin (Abendstunden, last ed. S. 392) discerns here the mystical "testimony of immediate intuition." Neander, confirming Schott and Lücke, maintains against this—the will of God cannot *here*

be a stumbling-block to all who are upright and intelligent, makes the knowledge of the truth of Jesus dependent upon the *doing of His doctrine*—it is evidently erroneous, inasmuch as it just overlooks the *mediating instrument*, to which our Lord's word here especially refers. The "will of God" is *here* certainly not (as in ch. vi. 40) the law of faith (thus Lampe concisely!)—the doing of His will is by no means the ὑπακοὴ πίστεως, when the ἀκοὴ has gone forth—πιστεύετε. For then the Lord would only say—He who only believes, will believe! A "believing in experiment," which wretched Pietists (in this worse than honourable Rationalists) impute to the people, means nothing; to experiment upon it is a wickedness which tempts God, and destroys the sense of truth in us. Thus we never may pray in experiment whether it will avail, never may follow Him on experiment whether He will approve Himself our guide. The Lord's word knows nothing of all this. But He lays hold of an established fundamental principle to which He makes His appeal, proceeding from which every sincere person will and must come to the believing knowledge that the doctrine of Christ is from God, and then afterwards go very much further. The old and most excellent M. Fr. Roos of Würtemberg hits the point well and simply—"no man is so ignorant in religion, as to know nothing of the truth; and no man is so disquieted by religious doubts, as not to perceive anything which he must feel to be the revealed will of God. Now Christ says, if any man will do His will *as far as he already discerns it*, he shall know," etc. (Christl. Glaubenslehre, S. 7, 8). This will of God is manifestly revealed "in the law and the prophets, and in our own conscience," as Von Gerlach comprehensively remarks. For Israel in the law, to which therefore in the closest connection ver. 19 refers, and in the prophets' preaching of repentance and faith which rests upon the law. But also for all heathens there remains a consciousness of God, which maintains its inviolable place in the practical

be understood as the will of God now first *manifested* in Christ, but only the will of God as far as the Pharisees might even in their position have already known it; thus the willingness to do that will is the subjective point of union in every man generally to which the objective evidence and conviction attaches itself.

conscience as a δικαίωμα τοῦ θεοῦ (Rom. i. 32).[1] And this is enough; for the doing of His will is from beginning to end the great and immovable essential in coming to God, and in the living knowledge of His name through fellowship with Him. "He who deals with his religion as a science merely, which he may indeed understand but will not practise (just as many are learned in geometry yet never measure a field), will never come to God aright."

Once more, the one great desideratum of humanity is the actual performance, the perfect fulfilling of the law, and this the grace and truth of Christ alone can bring within the range of possibility to man. Yet the Lord does not say—*If any man do.* "It is not of doing itself that the Lord first speaks, but only of *willing;* if this is pure and simple, there follows (through the strength of Christ) the ability to perform." (Albertini.) But the result in the case of all who hunger and thirst after the righteousness of a known or unknown God is that they first embrace with joy the words of Christ concerning justification through grace by faith, He becomes their consolation and gives their conscience rest; then follows in the accompanying new birth the reception of His strength, which confers upon the *willing* the perfect and absolute *doing.* *This* is the testimony that Christ's doctrine is of God which is alone possible to every one at the beginning; and this increases with increasing holiness in ever-progressing internal experience which approves its true divinity. The Lord speaks here, as the words run, more of the *beginning* of faith. Richter's Hausbibel says excellently: "ver. 17 is the least degree of, and the way to the testimony of the Holy Ghost, not this itself in its fulness." We add—He who will *do,* will learn to *believe;* he who deals earnestly with the Law first, will gladly embrace and fully understand the Gospel. But *then* when the *doctrine* is discerned and acknowledged to be of God, its whole fulness is entered into and explored; then results, as the Lord says to His *disciples,* ch. viii. 31, 32, the *following* of Christ, the participation of His Cross and Resurrection, the doing the whole truth in works, performed through Christ from and in God.

[1] Chrysostom: ἐάν τις ἐραστὴς ᾖ τοῦ βίου κατ' ἀρετήν. That is better than Grotius: qualemcunque voluntatem sibi revelatam.

Ver. 18. Or whether I speak of Myself! To this opposing hypothesis the Lord appends that other demonstration, which we denominated above the external evidence afforded by His lowliness. But what is the relation between this and that *internal experimental evidence* which discerns through the inward feeling of need that what He offers is the true nourishment of the soul? In a certain sense both are united and their force is blended, for here His person and His doctrine are one: the doctrine makes on every sincere soul, which would honestly and willingly be taught to do God's will, the impression of an offered Righteousness; while the Person legitimates Himself as trustworthy and true in all His testimonies and promises. Nevertheless the former is to be presupposed in order to the latter; for only he who is himself sufficiently sincere to be willing to do the will of God, will in his own humility be able to apprehend the lowliness of the Son whom the Father hath sent. Thus the evidence is quite rightly made to proceed from the internal spirit of every man who is to be convinced; and only in the susceptible does it proceed from without inwardly. The deceivers impute to the Lord deceit, the presumptuous presumption; but the sincere who will admit the influence of His truth into their souls, discern at once in the divine and pure humility of this enforcer of Truth, so utterly free from every taint of human vanity, the ineffaceable and incontrovertible seal of certainty. Thus we may say that the Lord goes on in ver. 18 to explain the process of the "shall know" in the honest heart:—he who in *inward* seeking and longing is ready to know and to do the will of God, and he alone, will be *externally convinced* by the humility of the meek and lowly one; because he will be able to *recognise* in that the pure seeking of God's glory. Moreover, the Lord in these words only calls to their minds and adapts to the present occasion, that which He had said at the feast of Purim, ch. v. 41–44; and we may therefore refer to our exposition at that place. The former clause—that he who speaketh (teacheth) of his own, assuredly therein must seek his own glory, is undoubtedly true, as constantly attested by all rightly understood and deeply investigated experience: consequently, the second, which is the converse and antithesis of the former, must also be true. It may be, and it has been said, that this proposition is not capable of universal

application, and that the Lord designed *only* to refer it to *Himself*, as ver. 16 and ch. v. seem to demonstrate. It is supposed, apart from Him, to be conceivable that a man in a lesser sense sent and commissioned of God, that is, a prophet, a teacher, might with fundamental sincerity seek the honour of God, and yet err and be untrue through human infirmity. This is assuredly true, but the Lord is not here speaking in any relative sense; but lays down a simple antithesis, which declares that no error is from God but must be of a man's own. Thus it remains an abiding truth that anamartesia in knowing and willing, in doctrine and life, is one and inseparable: consequently it is only to be found absolutely in that one Holy One whom the Father hath sanctified and sent into the world; and can be predicated even of apostles and prophets only within the limits and measure of their mission. Even they were not in their whole life free from error, because they were not free from sinfulness; only in their official function as discharged orally or in writing. Every error is in its very nature presumptuous and self-seeking; as the dictum of Jerome defines it in its highest degree—Omnis hæreticus est animal gloriæ! But then even in the case of apostles and prophets the sanctity of their personal life is no *distinctive* (however co-operating) criterion and evidence for the truth of their doctrine; but the concert of that with the complex whole of the revealed word of God and the testimony of the accompanying Holy Spirit. Thus, though the Lord is laying down a position which is really of universal application, it is obvious that in the very nature of the case He Himself alone can sustain perfectly the test of this most rigorous criterion. Who besides Him could dare to stand forward and give warranty for His whole life down to its minutest detail—Behold Me and learn of Me, for I am meek and lowly of heart? He only is absolutely free from taint as "seeking the glory of Him who sent Him," and therefore ἀληθὴς, because no occasion, or possibility of deceit exists for Him. Only in and upon Him is there no ἀδικία: not merely, that is, His cause is righteous—but ἀδικία is the comprehensive idea of sin (in will, in aim, in deed) and error in knowledge; with the full meaning of ἁμαρτία in ch. viii. 46.

Ver. 19. The expositors who would make this the beginning of a new discourse, have most assuredly failed to discern the full

meaning of all which has gone before. Now follows a reference ex opposito in illustration of what has been just said. Jesus understands and teaches the word of God, expounds the Holy Scriptures with a faithfulness of truth which must convince and overcome every man by its first influence, because He lives in the most entire and selfless obedience to the Father; but what kind of students of the law and expositors of Scripture must they be who wonder at His words and can moreover contradict them? They know and study the law, they glory in it as pre-eminently given to themselves—yet will they not keep the law! Therefore they can only *speak* about it, surround it with their subtilties, and make it the object of disputation; their impure minds cannot lay hold of its inmost truth, because they are ever seeking refuge from its keen meaning in subterfuge and bye-paths of error. The law was to Israel the first and most immediate portion of the will of God, ver. 17. These further words again go back to ch. v. 45–47, and are to be understood according to the fundamental meaning which we there endeavoured to disclose. It is well known that once in seven years the whole Law was read before the people at the feast of Tabernacles, Deut. xxxi. 10–13. This alone is enough to establish a specific reference in our Lord's words to the festal solemnity; whether, as Bengel thinks, this public reading occurred at the present feast, we must leave to the chronologists to determine, if they can.[1] The Lord says—*Moses* gave you the Law; not God by Moses, simply because the former was the manner of speaking among the Israelites, and because the Holy Scripture itself significantly so speaks, for example in Deut. xxxiii. 4. When He goes on to charge the whole people represented before Him at the feast, in this universal way—None of you keepeth the law, we must understand the *law* and the *keeping* of the law in a general sense, and not limit it to the specific example which follows. Just as Stephen afterwards in the Spirit of Jesus charges the self-same people (Acts vii. 53) with not fulfilling the law which they had received, inasmuch as they did not penitently acknowledge its requirements, but hypocritically in the name of the law rejected that Gospel for which it was the

[1] Sepp (iii. 50) has even calculated, in his way, that during the course of our Lord's public teaching, the entire canon of the law was read through in the synagogues.

design of the law to discipline and prepare them. And just as there Stephen couples with this their shedding the blood of the righteous (his own forerunners), the Lord Himself now speaks: —*Why go ye about to kill Me?* He who thinks of a trespass on their part against that single precept—Thou shalt not kill! is far from rightly understanding His meaning. By the rejection, hatred, and final crucifixion of Jesus, Israel did indeed break both tables of the law, deny to God His honour, hate their brother in hatred to God, instead of loving him in the love of God (ch. v. 42); and utterly refused *to be loved themselves.* Their enmity against the Holy and Just One, ripening into murder, is no other than the final and consummate outbreak of their opposition to the truth which He testified to them, and of their hatred to the will of God, or that law as the living exhibition of which He stood in their presence. Let the emphasis of the little word *τί*, so keenly penetrating their consciences and revealing the ground of their contradiction, be moreover observed:—*τί* or *διατί με ζητεῖτε ἀποκτεῖναι; Wherefore* am I, in My truth, lowliness, and sanctity, so hateful to you violaters of the law? Wherefore but because ye will persist in refusing to *do the will of God?*

So boldly and yet so simply does the Lord speak, with such majesty of meekness does He condemn, that the heavy inculpation may be regarded as at the same time the lamentation and request of His love—Let it be no longer so with you, act ye not thus. He brings out into light what was crouching in the darkness, and lays bare to them the secret impulses of their iniquity. A renewed contradiction on the part of the people gives occasion to His *second* discourse, wherein, after having been speaking of His *doctrine*, He justifies the works, that is, the miracles which confirmed it, out of their own law, and in the very matter concerning which they had made the law a pretext against Him. The Sabbath-healing at the former feast furnishes an obvious and appropriate example, for its offence was yet remembered and still exerted its influence. He had blended them all together as unbelieving and disobedient, not keeping the law, and yet not urged by their consciousness of sin to faith in Him; and it was not without perfect right that He ascribed to *this* people in common a murderous spirit and intention, already revealing to them what would come of their enmity, and what presently after-

wards was its actual result. There was in them an internal principle of enmity which their leaders might work upon; else the whole body of the people could never have been transported so far as to utter their "Crucify Him!" against the Righteous One, their benefactor, the worker of miracles, the great witness to the Truth! But now for the present the greater part of this people, especially the Galilæan visitors at the feast (see, for the distinction, ver. 25 afterwards), were neither privy to the ambushes of the rulers, nor were they altogether conscious of the full extent of their own enmity to Jesus; hence they protest wildly against what seems to them an insane accusation, and show by that same boisterousness of what they themselves might be capable. Speaking with dogmatic precision, this δαιμόνιον ἔχειν is something different from μαίνεσθαι (for which *distinction* and the transition from one meaning to the other, we may refer to Matt. x. 20); yet then, as now, such impetuous expressions of scorn in the mouth of the people (ch. viii. 48 introduces another element in addition) might easily become synonymous, and lose their preciseness of signification.[1] Thus Jesus has here the same measure dealt to Him as the Baptist at last had, according to Matt. xi. 18. It is not in harmony with the simple record of the Evangelist to suppose that they were the same ensnaring opponents who thus directed the thoughts of the people; since he describes their words as the immediate and impetuous *answer* which they made to the Lord's words. And equally irrelevant is the paraphrase: "that He was tormented by a demon of *disturbed mind*; a *fixed idea* which had mastered Him and made Him believe that His life was in danger," or that "a *spirit of morbid dejection* had put this fear into Him."[2] This notion may be regarded either as the result of a modernising tendency, or as in harmony with that older view of Scripture which is found in 1 Sam. xvi. 14, xviii. 10; but it will not harmonise with the δαιμόνιον ἔχειν of the time of Christ.

[1] The *Greek* δαιμονᾷν, *insanire*, gives no evidence on this question, scarcely containing an analogy which would be suitable in relation to Jews.

[2] Thus Lange, who adds further—"The frivolous people in the crowd easily jumped to the conclusion that Jesus was a morbid disturber of their peace, coming to interrupt the joy of their festivity." But we must be on our guard against these poetical incursions upon the letter of the narrative text.

Ver. 21. The Lord does not return their contumely, but answers their violence by an all the more serene elucidation of that which He had deliberately and solemnly said; turning, now as ever, their interruption to the account of His continuous apologetic testimony. It was a notorious fact that the unforgotten miracle at the pool of Bethesda had occasioned an unabating θαυμάζειν, a wondering excitement which was generally associated with a condemnation of His Sabbath-breaking: it is to this that He now appeals, and speaks to the contradicting people of no less than their χολῇν, ver. 23.[1] Klee and Baumgarten-Crusius understand this "marvelling" quite rightly as a "being offended;" but it must not be overlooked, how prudently the Lord begins with the lightest and most gentle expression. (But we cannot hold with Teschendorff—Ye *wondered* all of you at the first, *till* some came and imposed upon it the crime of Sabbath-breaking! for it stands in the Present—θαυμάζετε.) The Lord says ἓν ἔργον, *one work*,—what then is the antithesis of this? Some take it to be the many much more glaring violations of the Sabbath on the part of the people, in comparison of which they suppose that our Lord apologetically terms His own violation a very slight and isolated case.[2] But, on the one hand, such an even momentary and hypothetical admission (quite different from chap. xviii. 23 or Matt. xii. 27 with *if*) is quite beneath our Lord's dignity; and, on the other, we see that it is not His design to charge the people with manifold breaches of the Sabbath,—He rather concedes in ver. 23 their punctilious exactness in its observance. In the subsequent words of chap. x. 32 we have the true antithesis, and His meaning is—All My other many good works lose their value in your estimation and are forgotten, as soon as one of them becomes an offence! Thus the ἓν ἐποίησα involves a certain irony, but of the gentlest kind—"Be it so, I have only committed this one breach, and now let Me speak of that."

[1] It is contrary to the strict connection of the whole in St John's account, to assume (with Olshausen) that another similar intervening occurrence is here referred to.

[2] Fikenscher says—"Ye should be reasonable, and if I have committed an *error* (!) ye should not condemn Me on account of one only: for where is the man who has never transgressed the law, and how often have ye done it yourselves? How little does your sinful record wonder at Sabbath-desecration."

Vers. 22, 23. He so speaks of it as to make it the occasion of introducing a new and surprising analogy out of the law, to illustrate the collision between obligatory acts of benevolence in the healing and preservation of human life, and the external, rigorous observance of the letter of the Sabbath;—justifying, as He frequently does, His own exaltation of the one over the other. The διὰ τοῦτο is by most of the ancients (Euthym. like the Vulg., and similarly Nonnus οὗ χάριν) referred to what follows; but even in that case it should not be placed just as it is in the middle of the sentence (as in Luther's translation), for it then has no meaning;[1] but the meaning must be supplied (Winer § 7, 3)—Therefore *know ye*, therefore I say unto you. (It was reserved for Glassius to say that διὰ τοῦτο often, like לָכֵן, means *attamen!*) But this seems to us forced, and we prefer the construction—like Meyer's "ye all wonder *darob*, on that account,"—which connects the words with θαυμάζετε, in common with most of the moderns.[2] Lücke adduces proof from profane writers that θαυμάζειν, though seldom, yet sometimes, occurs with διὰ (not, indeed, in the Sept., but in Mar. vi. 6; Rev. xvii. 7, we find it); and Baumgarten-Crusius remarks that the ἕν is made more strongly prominent through the διὰ τοῦτο.[3] It is at least a similar construction which we have in St John's χαίρειν διά, ch. iii. 29. But more difficult and more important is the decision of the true meaning of the entire discourse concerning circumcision on the Sabbath; a matter which is far more confused than cleared up in most of our commentaries.

[1] Alford, indeed, sees "an appropriateness of meaning in ver. 22 with the διὰ τοῦτο, which it has not without it. Moses *on this account* gave you circumcision, not because it is of Moses, but of the fathers, *i.e.*, it is no part of the law *of Moses*, properly so called,—but was adopted by Moses, and thereby becomes part of his law." But ἐκ τοῦ Μωϋσέως would not then be repeated by name—for this manifestly indicates a *parenthesis*. [The repetition of ἐκ τ. Μωυ. ἐστ. does not necessarily imply a parenthesis: John constantly uses these formal repetitions: this in answer to Stier.—Alford.]

[2] Beza, Griesbach, Knapp, Lachmann, Lücke, Klee, B.-Crusius, etc., and Theophylact among the ancients.

[3] Which answers Alford's objection which demands δι' αὐτό for the construction with θαυμάζετε.

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA.

Much first of all depends, indeed almost everything, upon the view which is taken of the interjected οὐχ ὅτι. We cannot imagine that our Lord could mean thereby "an *undervaluation* of circumcision, as a mere legal form, *not* introduced by Moses, but through *tradition of the fathers*."[1] The sacred sign of the covenant of promise given before the law was holy as such even to our Lord for His age; and He cannot speak of that as a mere "tradition" of the fathers, which *God* had Himself appointed to Abraham.[2] Thus in Acts vii. 8 this covenant stands significantly before and above the succeeding law. As to the question wherefore Jesus did not mention Abraham, but the fathers, Lampe has already said: "To us it is most befitting, that Jesus should not place man in opposition to man, Moses to Abraham, as if Abraham's authority was superior to that of Moses. He rather compares the Mosaic and the *patriarchal* economies. Not persons, but the prerogative of dispensations, is concerned." Does the parenthesis, then, rather express the precise opposite—Moses gave unto you circumcision, as establishing more firmly an ancient and holy law? Not so, Kling insists against Lücke,—the observation is intended neither to elevate nor degrade circumcision, but only to correct the inexact form of expression which followed the popular usage. But such punctiliousness we can scarcely reconcile with the Lord's dignity, not even when "speaking with people who had been impressed by His knowledge of γράμματα."[3] If the more exact expression had no meaning of its own, the Lord would not have attached so much value to it as to append it. But a new difficulty arises, when we consider the question of circumcision being placed above the Sabbath as an older ordinance;[4] for Luther's inconsiderate marginal gloss is altogether vague—"keeping the Sabbath is a law of Moses, circumcision is a law of the fathers, and they come

[1] Thus Baumgarten-Crusius, and Hezel before him.

[2] Hence Hezel more cautiously at least—"from father Abraham, as an hereditary custom (appointed for him, indeed, by God in his time)."

[3] Not that they doubted, but they wondered at it as a thing proved.

[4] Bengel: "By this clause the dignity of circumcision is exalted, in respect to the Sabbath, than which it is older, and therefore entitled to take the precedence." And Lange speaks with similar want of exactitude of a precedency of circumcision over the Sabbath-festival.

into collision with one another." If Moses had taken circumcision into his law as an ordinance derived from the fathers, he had also incorporated the Sabbath from a still older original, even from *Paradise.* How then does circumcision take precedence of the Sabbath? It was indeed older than Moses, but the Sabbath was older still; thus is the later placed above the earlier? The solution of the whole appears to be this—that the Lord is not here speaking *immediately* of the paradisaical, patriarchal Sabbath, but of the *Mosaic*, that is, of the Sabbath as a total cessation from all work rigorously established in the law, and fenced with its strict sanctions. So says Grotius correctly: circumcisio est antiquior *rigido* otio Sabbati *per Mosen* imperato. And now first we understand the Lord's words to say—that even this *Mosaic* לא־תַעֲשֶׂה כָל־מְלָאכָה on which His opponents laid stress, could not possibly have been intended by Moses in so rigidly exclusive a meaning, for Moses could not contradict himself. Therefore it runs—*Moses* gave unto you circumcision, that is, he adopted without scruple the command given by God to the fathers "*on the eighth day*" (Gen. xvii. 12; Lev. xii. 3); the same Moses who imposed upon the Sabbath (also in existence from the beginning) its new strictness. *Consequently* ye see that circumcision as ordained of God before the law is quite in harmony with the renewed, albeit externally more rigorous Sabbath law;—*consequently*, that your present rigour is ungrounded, and places you in contradiction with yourselves and your own habitual fulfilment of the law in the article of circumcision. Did God forget the Sabbath, when He spake to Abraham of the immovable *eighth* day? Or did Moses scruple at all on that point? In this view the Lord's words proceed simply enough: *καὶ ἐν σαββάτῳ περιτέμνετε*, that is, "*Thus* in your practice the Sabbath and circumcision go on harmoniously together.[1] Ye neither think nor say anything about a violation of the law in this matter; but in your habitual practice ye take care that the whole law of Moses, which in itself is one, including the precept of circumcision on the eighth day, should be

[1] The corrected translation should mend this. Luther's *noch* oder *dennoch* beschneidet ihr—*nevertheless* ye circumcise—confuses the whole, as if there were a contradiction with what preceded. In the Hebrew New Testament (London, revised by Reichardt) it stands quite correctly וְגַל־כֵּן.

kept inviolate: *that the Sabbath precept is not thereby broken is self-evident from the same Moses.*"—Thus it is evident how unnecessary and incorrect is the forced translation of ἵνα μὴ λυθῇ which we find in Bengel (and then in Semler, Paulus, Kuinöl) —Ita ut non solvatur, salvâ lege; as also in the Bibles of Seiler, van Ess, Allioli—Without violating or transgressing it.

Thus far, it seems to me, all is clear. But now for the conclusion a minori ad majus, or the contrast between the circumcision of the ἄνθρωπος and the making whole of the ὅλος ἄνθρωπος —how is this intended by our Lord? At the first glance there are but two antitheses which present themselves—between the healing and the wounding, and then between the entire making whole and the only partial wounding or purification. As it regards the former, which Kling adopts and would connect with the latter, our unbiassed judgment, with all respect for the excellent Kling's general remarks on St John, must protest against it: for no man shall persuade us that Jesus in a public festival discourse would regard circumcision, contrary to all theocratical propriety, "only in its external form and operation!" Our inmost sentiment revolts against this; for it is in vain that we seek anywhere in Scripture for a passage (apart from the maternal complaint of Zipporah, Ex. iv. 25, capable, however, of an altogether different interpretation) which brings into view the wounding and painful side of the περιτομή. No, *the circumcising of a man* is here in the meaning of our Lord an act of benevolence, a deed of love, as we discern in the very word λαμβάνειν. We are therefore referred to the other contrast, since the ὅλος cannot possibly be meaningless in the text. Is then the ὅλον ἄνθρωπον (*a* or *the* whole man, the latter being doubtless intended as furnishing an example for the general position) to be taken as the opposite of the ἓν μέλος which was cut off, as Tholuck, Hess, Winer, and others think?[1] We protest once more against this, and this time *with* Kling, for that would be too external, Rabbinical, and petty a manner of speaking with respect to the sacred act "which did not purify one member only, but consecrated the whole man." Are we then to give up all notion of a contrast, and regard it merely with von Gerlach as a juxta-

[1] Circumcisio, quæ est in uno ex 248 membris hominis, pellit sabbatum, quanto magis totum corpus hominis. Tanchuma p. 244, 1.

position of the two Sabbath works in their equal significance for the healing of the entire man?[1] This will not help us, for why then was the ὅλον added only in the second, and not in the first, instance? I see no alternative left but to accept the interpretation which Bengel and Olshausen represent, though it has been much controverted:—that the Lord now speaks in addition of the well-known and striking *conversion* of the healed sinner; emphatically including this result (intended in all His dealings) in His *every whit whole* (ch. v. 11, 15). This altogether harmonises with our exposition of ch. v. 6 and 14.[2] Thus it is—The *whole* essential *man*, body and soul! This must ever be the ultimate aim of all the good deeds of the Saviour; and it is quite worthy of Him, and quite appropriate to the general theme, that He should point to this His high end and aim in connection with that one miracle in which it had been attained. He thereby says, moreover, what would otherwise be wanting to their most perfect judgment of the matter (οὐ κατ' ὄψιν, ver. 24):—Is it of no moment to you that a soul has attained salvation before your eyes through My good deed; do ye not appreciate the making whole of the entire man—*that highest end to which the law, circumcision, the Sabbath, and all the institutions of God, for ever tend, as the design to which they for ever point?*

On the contrast which still remains with the preparatory circumcision which certainly referred also to the *healing of the soul*, Bengel speaks so excellently that we will transcribe his observations in full:—"It is not the whole body of the man, which is opposed to the part circumcised; for a consequence, in the case of an admission, does not proceed from less to greater, in this way. It is lawful to circumcise a part, therefore it is lawful to cure the whole body. But it is the whole man, body and soul, ch. v. 14, whose healing is a benefit much greater, and, so much more becoming the Sabbath and sanctioned by the law, than the external act of circumcision regarded by itself, or even circum-

[1] Similarly Brandt's Schullehrerbibel:—His healing was at least as important a work as the circumcision of a child.

[2] This is not too subtle a meaning for the appreciation of the Jews (as Alford objects), but would be quite intelligible. Nor can we give up our conviction, that according to ch. v. 14 the full conversion of the healed man is intimated.

cision, *even though it should be regarded* as a *sacrament.* For circumcision is a mean: healing of the soul is an end." We take the latter of these suppositions, for we have already rejected the "external act regarded by itself." We do not say altogether with Olshausen (though not denying its relative truth) that circumcision related, like everything in the Old Testament, only to the σάρξ. Still less can we concur with Baumgarten-Crusius, contrary to that profound estimation of the Old Testament which we must ever assume in our Lord's words, in understanding it to mean—Ye circumcise that the law might not be abolished, in the external interest of a mere form![1] For our Lord neither thinks nor speaks in this disparaging way, of the νόμος and περιτομή. But—The circumcision imparts to the *child* (here, too, a preliminary allusion—not a ὅλος ἄνθρωπος) the reversion of the grace of God which will make him whole; the *typical* sign and promissory seal of future salvation, of that healing of the whole man in body and soul to which the foreskin stands opposed as the sign of our inherited sin and depravity; but what I have done and effected by so doing, is the realisation and fulfilment of the typical sacrament. This may probably have been Augustine's meaning in his contrast of the *signaculum salutis* and *salus* itself.[2]

We have but little to say, after establishing this true and elevated meaning, concerning the external seeming violation of the Sabbath by *work* in each case. There may be some truth and force in what is urged as to this point—that while Jesus' healing was effected by a single word alone,[3] the whole work of circumcision, especially including the binding up and precautionary measures for healing, was attended with considerable labour. The Rabbinical rule, which is generally quoted incorrectly, runs thus: מִילָה וּרְפוּאָתוֹ דּוֹחֶה אֶת הַשַּׁבָּת. But with Lange and Klee (following Cyril) to refer the making whole to that (if it is permissible to care for the healing of a circumcised per-

[1] Ebrard approximates to this when he makes the contrast—*ritual observance* and *good deeds.*

[2] B.-Crusius does not quote specifically, and we cannot refer to the passage.

[3] The Lord's lowliness allowed Him not to say expressly—I spoke one word only, rise and be whole!

son)—is altogether a perversion, since the discourse is simply concerning περιτέμνειν and περιτομὴν λαμβάνειν.

Finally, we must decidedly reject the notion which Lange, referring to Winer's Wörterbuch, admits:—that Jesus here also contemplates the *primitive* purport of circumcision in its bodily medicinal use apart from its typical design, then drawing a parallel between it and His "making whole." No scriptural theologian will yield to Hezel's assertion, that the *first* and *immediate* design of circumcision was medicinal. Even Michaelis, whose Mosaisches Recht is usually quoted here, says at the outset most pertinently that its *first* design, and that which God most expressly explained, was to be a sign of the covenant; and only afterwards does he diffidently intimate the possibility of a subordinate medicinal end, independent of this symbolical purpose. As Lange indeed goes on to say—the higher signification did not exclude the lower aim to make sanitary provision for the people's good. Let him think of it as he will! The opinion of the Jews, as Philo shows, went to the same point, though at most they only regarded it as a subordinate meaning of the Divine purpose—and even then with less reference to physical purity than to the requirements of fruitfulness. These allusions, however, are so far removed from the obvious design of a discourse which is strictly popular, and which is merely adducing analogy from the plain fundamental principles of the law, that we hesitate not to deny them altogether. Our own exposition, which is, we hope, more in harmony with the dignity of our Lord, and more theocratical in its tone, will be found sufficient.

Ver. 24. This simple sentence scarcely needs a word. Κατ' ὄψιν is, as Wetstein has shown, good Greek; and it *may* correspond with the Heb. לְפָנִים and נִשֹּׂא פָנִים. We incline to prefer the latter (in the place of לְמַרְאֵה עַיִן), since the words refer not merely to the appearance of the thing condemned, but (and this marks the *progress* of the appended thought) to the hated *Person* in whom it is condemned. It cannot, indeed, be proved that ὄψις may thus simply stand for πρόσωπον. In any case the Lord refers to such passages as Deut. i. 16, 17 (where πρόσωπον)—then Isa. xi. 3 (where κατὰ τὴν δόξαν)—finally Zech. vii. 9, κρίμα δίκαιον κρίνετε. The article in τὴν δικαίαν

κρίσιν[1] expresses very plainly such a comprehensive reference to the precept of their neglected νόμος which commanded in vain a righteous judgment.

The *third* discourse of our Lord, following the others in continuous progression, was occasioned by another interruption and colloquy of the people among themselves: emboldened by His public appearance and testimony, they raise more undisguisedly and more sincerely than in their previous γογγυσμός the great question *whether He was the Christ or not.* Since, however, no really right motive impels them to this, but He is constrained rather to declare that *they both know Him* and whence He is,—He must continue to utter His testimony against their perverse rejection of His Divine mission as the result of that unbelief which judged "according to appearance."

The people previously had refused to allow that any one was seeking to kill Him, and those who spoke might not have known thereof; but now, when He has brought to their minds the much condemned Sabbath miracle, certain inhabitants of *Jerusalem* bethink themselves—Yea, this is He whom our Rulers have since that time been plotting against! (We perceive that Jesus was far from being known personally to all; many beheld and heard Him for the first time in this feast.) His bold and fearless public speaking in the temple, which no man dared to prevent even by the protest of a λέγειν, certainly not by any intervention of force, extorted from this people the bold question—whether He were actually the Messiah! This sounds at first more than the previous timid attribution of ἀγαθός, but it is nevertheless a lower tribute, and bespeaks a less worthy feeling as its source. For they are under a wretched restraint; their own knowledge is made dependent upon the question whether *the rulers* in very deed knew and acknowledged Him. Miserable people, bound down to this slavish subjection; how far are they from that independent conviction which the Saviour had promised to every

[1] Braune makes the refined remark that probably Nicodemus afterwards, ver. 51, referred to this word, which he had heard and laid up in his heart.

sincere soul! How strangely in contrast with His γνώσεται, ver. 17, is the inquiry—μήποτε ἀληθῶς ἔγνωσαν; still worse—no sooner have they put forth their very bold, and almost ironical question, than they are abashed at their own temerity, and would atone for their curiosity by retractation. They will be guided in all things by their rulers; and give their own judgment in submissive conformity. They change their note—"Yet how could this be? The Christ when He appears will come in mystery, and His origin be unknown: but we know all about this man, His origin, father and mother!" Thus we see that their seeming previous ignorance of Jesus, who in ver. 25 is first recalled to their minds in connection with the recent miracle, was not the pure truth: they know this man, whom they so slightingly treat in His presence with οὗτος and τοῦτον, in *their* way very well; and this must come to light yet more and more. The whole proceedings betray nothing but insincerity on their part, and the utter want of all keen and penetrating earnestness of spirit. As inhabitants of Jerusalem, who hang upon the lips of their rulers, they have the watchword ready—οἴδαμεν; as proud dwellers in the capital they look down with supreme contempt upon His Galilæan origin (comp. ver. 52); yea they have, over and above, a little confused semblance of learning to bring to light. It is probable—for the positive πόθεν ἐστίν in their antithesis almost intimates as much—that they know by name father and mother, as they in Capernaum did, ch. vi. 42; but they *think* they know the birth-place, and suspect nothing about Bethlehem; see afterwards vers. 41, 42. Suffice that whatever they know tends only to confirm the unbelief of their hearts. Their half-knowledge on both sides, both as to this Jesus and their expected Messiah, like all half-knowledge, does nothing but confuse and lead them astray. We have, as Lücke rightly observed, no perfect and reliable account of the opinions of the learned *in that age*, and still less of the popular notions, concerning the Messiah; it is therefore a hopeless task to attempt to illuminate by Rabbinical erudition what must be left in obscurity. We see, indeed, that many afterwards admit the Galilæan to be the Messiah, while the chief men, again, in direct contradiction to 2 Kings xiv. 25, and Nah. i. 1, know nothing of a prophet rising in Galilee, nor think of the Messiah in connection with

Isa. ix. 1, 2.[1]—Thus much seems to be clear, that they have a certain indefinite, distorted notion of the higher, miraculous origin of the Messiah; and oppose this to the notorious human origin, as they suppose, of Jesus.

In general this chapter exhibits to us a strange mixture of contradictory demands, opinions, expectations, frames of mind, and tendencies; the desire to know without any accompanying intelligence, secret hate and secret fear, in strange counterpoise and conflict, agitating the minds of all. But in the midst of all He stands who is the Light of the world, uttering His luminous words, with an answer, ever new yet ever the same, for the contradiction of all! Thus it is now for the third time.

Ver. 28. With profound sorrow in His inmost heart, but yet for the truth's sake with unavoidable *irony*, He concedes to them their miserable οἴδαμεν; He, however, as meekly as perseveringly, repeats the unwearied οἶδα of His own testimony, that He is from the Father. Their colloquy concerning Himself in His presence has become so tumultuous that He is constrained, contrary to His wont, to gain a hearing by crying aloud into the midst of the multitude; but the Evangelist carefully appends his own διδάσκων, in order that we may not misinterpret this κράζειν as the unseemly utterance of injured feeling or passionate zeal. Many would regard the first clause as a *question;* that so the irony may be obviated, which Richter regards as beneath the dignity of Christ.[2] But our exposition has detected and justified so much that is ironical, such passages as Matt. xxiii. 31, to wit, that we find no need of any such evasion, even if it did, as it does not, harmonise with the κἀμέ at the commencement. Nor can we any more understand the direct sentence as an actual admission that they were rightly acquainted even with His human origin, and in a certain sense knew Him and His πόθεν (as Lücke, v. Gerlach, Richter, and others think)—for in ch. viii. 14, 19, He speaks quite otherwise. Such a concession in His question, condescending to their false point of view, appears to us much more unbecoming than the mournful and lamenting irony which Flaccius and Calvin, with many others, have dis-

[1] It is taught even in the Sohar, that Messiah the King will manifest Himself in Galilee. In Gen. fol. 74, col. 3; and in Ex. fol. 3, col. 3.

[2] Bengel assures us—ironia nunquam usum invenias Dominum?

cerned in the words—Yea, ye know Me, and from whence I am![1]

On the following clause, which contains other thoughts amply illustrated already, there arises only one question,—whether the ἀληθινός be on this occasion equivalent to the ἀληθής of ver. 18, or whether we must adhere to its general meaning in St John's phraseology. Grotius understood it to mean—It is My true, essential Father, who hath sent Me, which was contained in the πόθεν; but no one will defend such an interpretation. Tholuck —He is a real and essential God, not the imaginary God of your thoughts. Similarly Brandt—The true, living, and hidden God. And Olshausen thinks that here the ἀληθινὸς θεός, as He essentially is, is opposed to the imperfect, notional knowledge of Him which the Jews had. Lücke and Lange interpret it—My true *Sender*. But all this appears to us too artificial, not *popular* enough for this simple testimony to the people; and we would suggest, as a philological refinement, whether then the article should not have preceded. Comparing ch. viii. 26, xix. 35; Rev. iii. 7, 14, xix. 11, we hesitate not to translate, with Erasmus—*verax;* for which many from the most ancient times till now have declared themselves. (Cyrill., Chrysost., Euthym., Theophyl., and among us Lampe, B.-Crusius, etc.) Kling very soundly develops the thought that as it is deceitfulness which would be contrasted in the arbitrary and presumptuous ἀπ' ἐμαυτοῦ, consequently the antithesis would require a mission from one who was true. But this truth arrogated for God is not to be understood in the sense of Nonnus' addition—εἵνεκα πομπῆς; or, as Cocceius and others interpret it, of the fulfilment of the promises through the mission of Christ, for this is quite foreign to the present subject. That which follows shows us the right method:—because *they* know not the true God, know not His truth, or Him in and according to His truth, *therefore* they also know not Him whom this true God had sent. Thus we have the same testimony which constantly recurs in various forms—He only who knows and acknowledges God in His already revealed truth, either will or can believe in Christ! Quite parallel with this is ch. viii. 54, 55 once more. Thus the

[1] Glassius unhesitatingly places this passage in his chapter of irony.

token of the Messiah which they insisted upon holds true, but also it is approved in their own case, and in a very different sense from theirs.

Ver. 29. This is the strongest, most simple, and concentrated, closing testimony of the whole discourse; coinciding with that of vers. 16, 17. It is of little significance whether or not δὲ is genuine; though without it the expression would be still more direct and positive, and its most direct assurance would be entirely safe from every contradiction. Before this οἶδα of the Divine-human self-consciousness of Jesus, all the confused conflict concerning it which agitates the Christian world now, as the Jewish then, must melt away. But His knowledge of God involves a *twofold* consciousness—which in this verse, as everywhere, we should be careful not to overlook or lightly pass over—His knowledge according to His eternal Sonship of a pre-existent εἶναι παρὰ θεοῦ (ch. viii. 58), and His knowledge of His being sent into the world as man, of His being come from the Father or from heaven. The former is a necessary presupposition for the latter, which is unimaginable without it. Hence here the παρ' αὐτοῦ εἰμι clearly responds first to the κἀμὲ οἴδατε; and then the κἀκεῖνός με ἀπέστειλεν to the πόθεν εἰμί.[1]

FURTHER WARNING TO THE UNBELIEVERS:—YET A LITTLE WHILE AM I WITH YOU!

(Ch. vii. 33, 34.)

The Evangelist paints by strong though delicate touches the historical process of the enmity which was excited against the Lord; he does not forget the human procedure in his contemplation of the hour and power of the Divine counsel; and delineates the background of Christ's person and word with the pencil of a master, uniting art and nature, the most suggestive

[1] Here, then, we have the correction and supply of de Wette's deficiency, who could contentedly declare, on ver. 28, that the Lord did not ascribe to Himself in opposition to them, *a supernatural origin*, but only a "*Divine mission*." What Apostle or Prophet, with "Divine mission," could ever say—I am of God!

composition of the whole being blended with the plainest truthfulness of detail. In any other treatise than this of ours much might be written upon this subject which would tend to reassure many in their confidence that the historiography of the Holy Ghost is a great truth, and the criticism of its modern enemies only a lie. Yet, in simply adhering to the *words* of Jesus, we are vindicating most strenuously the Gospel itself; since even here *they* shine forth as beams of light upon the dark background.

Ye know not God! Yet He hath sent Me to you! This simple and elevated declaration exerts a twofold influence:—some would have laid hold upon Him at once, if their daring had been equal to their will; many, on the other hand, begin to entertain something like faith in His plain and boldly repeated assurance. These latter reply to the objection, which had been urged in ver. 27, by a bold question; the weakness and imperfection of their faith, however, is exhibited:—not so much by its avowal in the form only of question, as by its dependence (so contrary to the method prescribed in ver. 17) upon *miracles*, and those as valued by their *number*. At this point it is announced to the Pharisees, the ruling party in the council, by their spies, how matters are going in the temple, and what a tone of mind and feeling the bold words of Jesus had excited among the people. It is improbable that just at this festival-time they were holding a sitting in the לִשְׁבַּת הַגָּזִית; we should rather suppose that they met by concert in reference to this express occasion. Suffice that the first official mandate is now sent forth against Him; officers are sent to take Him in the temple. But the Lord goes tranquilly on to speak yet once and again, until His hour has come. The seventh chapter now sets before us specifically *two* more discourses, in which He warns the unbelieving against a neglect of the day of grace, invites believers to come and receive out of His fulness, which will then be opened up and stream forth in all its abundance when His enemies shall imagine that they have put Him away for ever. In both discourses He speaks of the same, ever more nearly approaching, catastrophe of His δοξάζεσθαι. The αὐτοῖς of ver. 33 is rightly to be rejected, but even if it remained it would not imply that what follows was spoken to the officers sent, but that the Lord spoke further to

the mixed multitude composed of enemies and friends, yet with special reference to His enemies, and with reference to that measure which was not concealed from His knowledge.

Ver. 33. The Lord has an accurate knowledge of His own time, and therefore speaks thus definitely—ἔτι μικρὸν χρόνον. He attaches His words as He proceeds to the former τὸν πέμψαντά με; but now adds the ὑπάγειν, upon which Grotius pertinently remarks—renunciaturus legationem, quasi dicat, videte, quomodo tractandus sit vobis legatus. I will render account unto God of the result of My embassage to you His rebels! Meanwhile, in connection with the warning against rejection and neglect which is here so prominent, there is manifest the same supplicating exhortation rather to believe, which is expressly added in chap. xii. 35, 36; while in chap. viii. 21 the full declaration recurs with yet more rigorous warning. Μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰμι speaks yet of offered mercy within the limits of the unexpired day of grace. They would and they will remove Him out of the way, put Him to death—but they will only thereby send Him back to the Father from whom He came; rather it is He Himself who will freely and voluntarily *go* when His hour is come.

Ver. 34. And now He goes on to say—Just then, when ye shall think that ye have put Me away and destroyed Me from your midst, will ye first begin to seek Me, but then in vain. It is not as if He would intimate that when they might think they had seized Him, He would elude them. And can the ζητεῖν which He here predicts, be the same malicious and crafty ζητεῖν with which thay now lay in wait for His life? (As Origen thought, and Grotius, with others among the moderns—Your enmity will then touch Me no more.) Most assuredly not, for that is so obviously to be understood of itself, that He needed not to say it; the Lord makes reference not to His own salvation and security against those men, but to *their own* rejected and mocked salvation, as a comparison with ch. viii. 21 manifestly shows. Olshausen rightly remarks, against that very inappropriate view, that the οὐχ εὑρήσετε must correspond with the μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰμι; and that the distinctive ζητήσετέ με of ch. xiii. 33 leaves no doubt of the *good* sense in which the ζητεῖν here is to be understood, as meaning to seek and long after with ardent

desire. If, with Lücke, we regarded the whole saying as a mere formula of amplification applied by St John himself, in which the ζητεῖν is without any specific meaning,[1] our exposition would be simple enough; but we very much doubt the propriety of assuming any such difference between the essential utterances of our Lord and the Evangelist's style of reporting them. The right interpretation, as acknowledged by Tholuck in his later edition, and before him represented by Luther and Lampe, is very obvious and plain to the truly practical understanding: hence the annotated Bibles (Berlen., Hirchb., Brandt, v. Gerlach, Richter) are all agreed upon it. Ye shall seek *Me*, that is, as I truly am, and would now be to you, a Messiah, a Saviour from sin and misery—but after My rejection ye shall find none.[2] Lu. xvii. 22, 23 is strictly parallel. The fundamental idea is also the same with that of Prov. i. 21–28. If unbelief despises and neglects the time of offered mercy, there follows in righteous judgment the period of its hardening, in which strictly speaking it *can no longer seek* in a right sense, but, bereft of faith and light, grasps aimlessly nothing; and it is this perverse, never finding, hardened, and ineffectual seeking of the Jews, continuing to this day, that our Lord here predicts. This is not merely "its prophetic undertone," as Lange thinks, but the most essential meaning of this word, besides which it has no other. Isa. viii. 21, 22, finds in this its consummate fulfilment, compare Amos viii. 11, 12.

In the following clause an equal emphasis must be laid upon the οὐ δύνασθε, which testifies in general that man cannot by his own power penetrate whither Christ leads His believing people, into heaven where the Father is. This holds good in a milder sense for the disciples themselves tarrying behind for a while, ch. xiii. 33–36—on the other hand, however, our Lord promises to His servants and followers at the end—Where I am,

[1] So de Wette: "after the Hebrew manner the seeking here means only the not finding, the mere fact of not being present; with all your seeking ye *would* not find me." Grotius: "si me quæratis, non comparebo."

[2] Rauh: "because they would continue to seek in that Messiah what He never could be to them." Quite correct, apart from the strange connection which He would establish with the withdrawal after the miraculous feeding. (Deutsche Zeitschrift, 1850. S. 279.)

there shall they also be! ch. xii. 26. Thus we have in a new parallel and in a new connection the ὅπου εἰμὶ ἐγώ of this passage, which is thus,—and this has its force,—the standing expression of our Lord. Thus we must not be led astray by the circumstance that in ch. viii. 21 and ch. xiii. 33 ὅπου ὑπάγω takes its place: for this gives another application only to the words, coinciding with the idea which is *here* also previously expressed by a preliminary ὑπάγω. We may not therefore read εἶμι here in this one place, contrary to the usage of the entire New Testament;[1] but adhere with the Syr., Vulg., and Luther to the εἰμί, in connection with which we would with Euthym. supply τότε.[2] Where I *then am*, where I *shall be* after My departure, which through your rejection will be to you an entire and absolute going away—ye shall not be able to come, with all your half penitent, half persistently perverted seeking and endeavour. And has not this been fulfilled in Israel even to the present day? Yet not only in Israel, but in all who pass by and neglect the Lord's word in ch. xiv. 6; yea, even to the faithful who have found and possess Him in their hearts, it remains true, that they also must wait upon the earth until He shall come and fetch them home where Himself is.

Pfenninger represents his excellent Zephonias as writing to Severus concerning the discourses of this chapter thus: "Thou seest what eternal contradictions are here—or, I would say, seem to be here. Now the people will make Him their King, and He eludes them and departs from them. Now He declares Himself to be the Messiah, and to have come down from heaven; then again He represents Himself as suddenly going away. Now they are laying snares for His life, and He removes Himself as one afraid; then He puts forth in the temple, and in the

[1] As in some MSS. which Schöttgen's Lex. accepts; as Nonnus, translating ὁδεύσω; as Theophyl. expresses it, though probably in an inexact quotation; as the Ethiop., Copt., and Arab. versions read. H. Stephan., Casaub., Ludov. de Dieu, and Beza prefer this reading also; and, finally, Bengel himself decides for it, on account of the parallel ὑπάγω, adducing two passages from the Sept. and some from classical authors to establish the prosaic propriety of εἶμι.

[2] That is, supply it in exposition; in which, nevertheless, as the Lord then spake, the emphasis of the essential present is significant (which Alford erroneously regards me as forgetting).

very neighbourhood of the council-chamber of His foes, the boldest pretensions, knows Himself to be in jeopardy yet remains standing there, no man daring to lay hands on Him. Ah, who shall solve all these mysteries to me, O Severus!" This is a good representation of the state of things preceding His δοξάζεσθαι. But when after the ἐδοξάσθη the solution of the mystery is missed by so many who behold it, what shall we say of *their* unbelief? What shall we say to that criticism, which takes offence at and scorns the "Johannæan Christ," even as His enemies did then? Let us mark, however, with reverence, with what sublime elevation this Christ, with all His "contradictions," stands before us for the contemplation of all who truly believe on Him!

Among the Jews of that time, as St John records, all else was absorbed in bitter mockery, for they had no apprehension whatever of a "going to the Father." Whither then will His journey be, that we should not reach Him? *They* think perversely of their ζητεῖν as His enemies, and say in their hearts (as Teschendorff paraphrases)—In Palestine there are no ways not open to us! But—will He go into *other lands?* For it is evident that *place* and not people is here intended, as the residence of their people was the great point in all their notions of geography; and the expression διασπορὰ τῶν Ἑλλήνων,[1] is not the same with the διασπαρέντες themselves. Those who (like Hezel) interpret the words simply—to the dispersed Jews, *or even* to the Gentiles—take away their critical point and force.[2] Their mockery takes this turn at once:—will He, since His pretensions succeed not with *us*, carry them to the *Gentiles* (Syr. לְחַנְפָּא impios)? Thither we should not follow Him, indeed![3] It must remain matter of doubt whether they speak thus as having marked His promises even to the heathen;[4] thus much is

[1] As Salmas. rightly perceived; and the Peschito has בַּי.

[2] It is altogether erroneous to understand the Hellenists in both places, as Meyer and B.-Crusius do (after Calv., Scalig., Lightf., Hammond), for they are never termed Ἕλληνες. In the New Testament Ἕλληνες are invariably the Gentiles as opposed to Jews.

[3] Ver. 36 then only means—or if we do not thus understand Him aright, what does He say or mean in His unintelligible words?

[4] Neander thinks it "a point worthy of note, that their anxiety to make Him a heretic was founded upon a dawning *presentiment*, excited by many of Christ's intimations, that His teaching was destined to be universal.

certain, that the Evangelist gives us this saying as an unconscious prediction of these Jews, in which they are forced to utter their own condemnation.[1]

INVITATION TO BELIEVERS: PROMISE OF THE STREAMS OF LIVING WATER.

(Ch. vii. 37, 38.)

Ver. 14 began with the middle of the feast, and the connection is clear down to ver 31. About ver. 32 we may go on to a following day, but not yet the last, of the feast. The officers (whose return ver. 45 may retrospectively refer to a former day, but possibly may not) have not laid hands on the Lord—some had mocked against Him, others had murmured for Him, and there it rested. The Lord now on the last and most festal day of the feast pronounces His great promise—obscure to those who heard it—and the notification of the particular feast-day gives us an unmistakeable intimation that, besides the *Scripture* which was appealed to, there was in His words a reference to the customs of the feast which might lead to a correct understanding of their meaning. Else why was this definite statement of the time inserted? This was sufficient for Jewish readers; and as it regards futurity it pleased the Holy Spirit to leave something for Christian investigation. And that investigation has almost universally determined that our Lord spoke thus strikingly of the streams of living water, because a symbolical ceremonial of pouring out water belonged to the feast of tabernacles, and has just preceded His words. We have, moreover, the entire Tract. Succa in the Babylonish Talmud expressly devoted to this feast, and Dachs and Cramer have profusely illustrated it from Rabbinical materials.

The feast of Tabernacles had degenerated in the lapse of time

[1] Rauh: "We cannot but hear now, as in the similarly ignorant prophetical word of Caiaphas, even in the midst of their malicious mockery, a truth which annihilates the mockers themselves."

into a tumultuous harvest-rejoicing which closed the feasts of the year in carnal merriment after the solemn day of atonement: its symbolical meaning had been fancifully carried out, and overlaid with many customs which destroyed its true intention. This went so far that heathens, such as Plutarch (Symposiac. lib. iv. quæst. 5, with a marvellous array of evidence; compare, however, the contradiction in Tacitus hist. lib. v. cap. 5) could discern in this θυροφορία and κρατηροφορία of the Jews a Bacchic festivity. The κρατηροφορία of Plutarch gives at any rate a sure testimony concerning the custom of that time, as reported by the Rabbies and called by them שִׂמְחַת בֵּית הַשּׁוֹאֵבָה (Joy of the drawing water), and concerning which they said:—He who has not seen this rejoicing, has never seen yet what true joy is. For, on each of the seven days, early after the morning sacrifice, a priest drew water with a golden pitcher from the fountain of Siloah at the foot of Mount Zion.[1] This was borne in pompous procession and jubilant music[2] through the water-gate into the Temple, and poured out on the western side of the altar of burnt-offering. There was no wine mixed with it (as Lundius and others say); but wine and water unmixed and in separate silver vessels accompanied. Nor was "part of it drunk," as Hess without any genuine authority asserts, but the water was poured into a pipe conduit which carried it below out of the mountain again. Spencer (de Legg. Hebr. rit. iv. 2) and Lakemacher (Obss. phil. 1 pag. 18), derive this usage with very great improbability from the heathen libations; for we find as early as 1 Sam. vii. 6, comp. 2 Sam. xxiii. 16, something of the same kind, and points of union with Old Testament symbolism generally are not wanting in this matter.

Whether this שׁוֹאֵבָה took place on the eighth day, as Lundius and others say, is, to say the least, doubtful: see Lücke in his commentary. We find it, indeed, mentioned in Tract. Succa, though only as the unallowed and solitary opinion of Rabbi Juda Hakkadosch, that it was done every day of the eight. The eighth day was originally only a kind of after-feast,

[1] According to Jerome on Isaiah, *not* of Mount Moriah—see Winer to v. Raumer.

[2] Hence Nonnus speaks of χοροστὰς ἑορτή.

as the last feast day of the year. According to Numb. xxix. 12–38, the number of the sacrifices diminished gradually through the seven feast-days from thirteen to seven bullocks, making altogether seventy; and on the eighth an additional bullock was offered. Yet on this day, also, there should be an עֲצֶרֶת, which much-contested word is interpreted by the LXX. ἐξόδιον, by the Vulg. *collecta*, by Luther *Versammlung;* Jun. and Tremellius, and Michaelis Suppl. *interdictum* (*scil. laboris*); but the Rabbis explain it as the end of the feast, or (as if עֲצֵרָה, *cohibitio*, *detentio*) as the holding on of the expiring feast, and detention of those who celebrated it.[1] This last harmonises with the assertion of Gesenius, and with the interpretation, to us most probable, πανήγυρις. It is, however, certain, that in process of time the eighth day attained a distinctive and pre-eminent significance. It was said that the seventy bullocks were offered for the seventy nations of the earth (a traditional hint of the prophetical symbolism of the feast of Tabernacles, not to be despised): but now on the eighth day the Lord invited His own people *Israel* to special and confidential joy.

On which day was it that Christ spoke the words now before us, or which does St John signify by the ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ μεγάλῃ?—The ancients[2] decide for the seventh, which was called, on account of the Hallel seven times sung הוֹשַׁעְנָא רַבָּא: and on which, according to the fable of the Rabbis, God determined how much rain should fall during the year. But of late nearly all critics, following Lampe, decide for the eighth. We prefer the latter view, though very little is affected by it, and certainly is not attainable. But not the latter view because of what is said in ver. 53, that every man went unto his own house, and consequently no longer to the tabernacles: for this verse, or at least the day referred to in it, is itself very uncertain, since ver. 45 may introduce a subsequent event. But because St John cannot be regarded as speaking with legal exactness in the word ἑορτή, in which he rather embraces popularly the whole of the festivities; and the name applied in Tr. Succa to the eighth day, which was equally kept sacred—יום טוֹב

[1] Abarbanel: ויעצרו לשבת בירושלים גם אותו היום see Buxtorf. Syn. cap. 21.
[2] Buxtorf, Lightfoot, Cocceius, Vitringa fil., Reland, etc.

הָאַחֲרוֹן שֶׁל חַג, seems to suit the description of the Evangelist better than that הוֹשַׁעְנָא רַבָּא. Still, it is not exactly as Lücke puts it, that we must either accept R. Juda's single authority as to the pouring out of the water on the eighth day, or, supposing that Jesus spoke on that day, renounce any allusion in His words to the preceding seven days' שׁוֹאֲבָה. We hold with Lange on this point, that there is more fitness in supposing the circumstance over before its signification is pointed out. But we demur to the ingenious explanations which, without any Rabbinical traces, he inlays into his exposition; such as that the temple-mountain having no spring of its own was typical of the insufficiency of this temple-service; and that the outlying and oft-despised fountain of Siloam, Isa. viii. 6, was therefore a symbol of the prophetical Spirit; that on the close of the eighth day, and after the drawing of water was concluded, the *sense of deficiency*, calling to mind the promised issuing of waters from the temple itself (Ezek. xlvii.), took possession of people's minds, and that our Lord founded upon such feeling His promise. All this is very beautiful, but it is too far-fetched and uncertain a foundation for the Lord's words, which need no such elaborate introduction.

Thus much, however, is historically certain (if the Talmud is to have any authority for the time of Christ) that in connection with the drawing of water, prayer was offered for rain at the seed-time; that not only was the great Hallel sung, with its close of most important though oft unrecognised Messianic prophecy (Ps. cxiii.–cxviii.), but also, in all probability, Isa. xii. 3, a passage which in many ways has been referred to this feast. Further, as the tents brought the journey through the wilderness plainly before the mind, so the remembrance of the water miraculously supplied would not fail to be understood. Finally, and it deserves careful notice, the Rabbins, amid much other fanciful reference, have expressly referred this water to the *outpouring of the Holy Ghost.*[1] On the whole, St John's reference of this cry of our Lord to the feast as apprehended in its joyful close, is plain enough: it suits very well the prominence previ-

[1] Maimonides quotes this as an ancient opinion. Compare also the passage in Sepp iii. 57, "They draw up the Holy Ghost in that water."

ously given to the *law*, and the *light* subsequently mentioned ch. viii. 12, to which there was also something analogous in the usages of the festival. It is in the great condescension of His love that the Lord does not disdain to base His words upon the true meaning of a ceremonial self-chosen, and of Divine service which Israel offered to God in carnal and thankless festivity.

That which He had earlier spoken by the still well of Jacob in Samaria, He now publicly announces to all Israel on the great feast-day. It is the same long-forbearing invitation with which His new revelation closes in Rev. xxii. 17. *If any man* thirst—this is His unwearied cry of solicitation—and were there not some who yielded themselves to its influence? The less effect His word had upon those who heard its dying echoes then, the more evident is its reference to futurity, the more plain its prophetic impress for time to come. And if He perceives in the usages of human invention the foundation of a prophetical meaning, it must evidently be through tracing it up to congenial truth in the sacred canon—hence we see the plain necessity for the following καθὼς εἶπεν ἡ γραφή.

But where do we find in Scripture that of which the Lord now speaks? It is not a literal quotation; and it was a very narrow though well-meaning notion of old time that it was to be referred to some lost or *Apocryphal* book,[1] though Bleek to our astonishment has revived it. (Whiston speaks of a lost passage.) It is an intolerable sophistry, and declines the question altogether, to take εἶπε in this place "with the meaning of commanding."[2] Not much better is the opinion of Euthym., Chrys., Cyrill., and Theophyl., who allow the citation, but refer back to passages in Scripture which speak of *faith*.[3] We feel that the very point and distinctive force of the sentence is in "rivers of

[1] For it not only merely did not consist with "our Lord's wisdom as a teacher to use any other than the canonical medium" (Lücke)—but there is a real ground of distinction between the canon and the Apocrypha.

[2] Heinsius in Arist. Sacr. p. 406. Fresenius Predd. herausg. von v. Meyer, S. 449. Yet Fikenscher revives this—"He who *believes* in Me, with such faith as the Holy Scriptures require, and not such as the lying lips of men proclaim it."

[3] Surenhusen will have the saying to refer both to what preceded and what follows. Rus defends the first connection of καθώς with πιστεύων.

water shall flow," and that this must be found in Scripture. But where?

According to our conviction, which is based upon the fact that the New Testament citations are never to be held as merely general, such promises and invitations as we find in the prophecies of Isaiah are not quite sufficient to meet the case, although, as we shall see, they may converge into a general citation. Such are Isa. lv. 1 (Ho every one that *thirsteth*, come ye to the waters!); chap. xliii. 20 (I give waters in the wilderness, and *rivers* in the desert, to give *drink* to My people, My chosen!); chap. xliv. 3 (I will pour water upon him that is thirsty, and floods upon the dry ground!) Still less applicable is the fountain opened for sin and for uncleanness in Zech. xiii. 1, which is for washing and not for drinking; or the womb of the morning, Ps. cx. 3, which Reichel, the expositor of Isaiah, brings forward,—see upon chap. lv. 1. Although the former places of Isaiah aptly enough speak of drinking and flowing waters, we find wanting some "Scripture" from which might have been taken the "shall flow," and if possible also "out of his belly;" indeed we should desire it to stand in some relation to the festal drawing. And we are met by that significantly repeated prophetic promise of a fountain and stream which should in the Messianic future flow from Jerusalem, from the holy mountain, or properly from the temple itself—in Joel iii. 23, Zech. xiv. 8 (where it is expressly יֵצְאוּ מַיִם־חַיִּים), and particularly Ezek. xlvii. 1–12 where the figure indeed changes its application, but in Rev. xxii. 1, 17 is taken up again. Now that which is thus promised as a thing new, and in the future, to the *temple* (to which in the type the water must be brought with toil),[1] and in figurative allusion symbolizing the new spirit and life, might be most appropriately referred to by the Lord during this festival when the typical water was being fetched up from the valley

[1] For it is hard to believe what has been said concerning the secret water-treasures of the mountain on which the temple was built (see, *e.g.*, v. Raumer's Palästina, who even brings the above prophecies into connection with them). Sepp, indeed, has much to relate about them, ii. 208. But afterwards in Vol. iii. 53 he has forgotten that, and contradicts himself by the true assertion that there was no fountain of living water in connection with the old temple.

to the temple. But who and what is in the consummation the new temple, the new Jerusalem become one great Sanctuary? We say rightly indeed—the *church* of the Lord, particularly regarded in the final perfection, to which the prophetic words point forward.[1] But only in the church as a whole, as far as the Lord Himself fills and pervades His church, and pours forth from her the streams of His unexhausted blessing:[2] the same cannot possibly be attributed to *every individual* πιστεύων as such (though the Lord uses this language expressly), as we shall hereafter see more at large. On the other hand it is Christ, in His own most sacred person, yea, according to Jno. ii. 21 His *body*, which is the true *temple* of God (let this be carefully observed at the outset!) consequently He may rightly be regarded as referring to *Himself*, even as He proceeds—If any man thirst let him come *unto Me* and drink. Are we not to be quite prepared to hear Him go on—from *Me* flow forth the promised streams of living water! In effect we can only thus understand the αὐτοῦ, and thus find a citation which collects together in one many several passages of the Old Testament:—these Scriptures all speak of Me![3]

But, in order to this, we must receive a *punctuation* of the passage, which is opposed to nearly all ancient and modern exposition, but which, as often as we recur to it, appears to us more and more certainly to be the only correct one. It is, indeed, not quite unknown to the learned, though by them little esteemed; it seems particularly (and this *to us* only serves as a recommendation) to have enforced itself in the domain of *practical* understanding, and in quarters independent of each other. This is reason enough, if it can be established, to oppose it to a universal learned tradition. Let the passage be thus disposed:—Ἐάν

[1] We do not deny, indeed, that in the last days (Isa. ii. 2, 3) this prophecy will have a more literal fulfilment. The Lord thought also of the Jerusalem which should bless the earth in that far-distant futurity, while He looked upon the then Jerusalem before Him: but He fixes our thoughts upon the more near and obvious meaning for the immediate future.

[2] Even this must not be so pressed, in the style of Schleiermacher, as to substitute the Church for the Lord! (Schleier. Homil. über. John ii. 51.)

[3] The Peschito has, instead of ἡ γραφή, the plural כְּתוּבָא.

τις διψᾷ, ἐρχέσθω πρός με, καὶ πινέτω ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμέ· καθὼς εἶπεν ἡ γραφὴ· ποταμοὶ κ.τ.λ. "And let him drink thereof who believeth on Me! as the Scripture (concerning Me) promises," etc. This is far from being, as Lücke says, no more than a mere proposal of Bolten. Bengel is disposed at first to regard this new punctuation as plausible, but afterwards considers it as harsher than the received one; we cannot think it, however, at all more harsh than the Nominative absolute with the interjected καθὼς εἶπεν.[1] The Berlenb. Bibel refers to "many" who thus read. Reitz, in his notes to Goodwin's Moses et Aaron (5th edit. p. 294) proposes this as the resolution of every difficulty. The Strassburg edition of the New Testament of 1524 has this punctuation. J. J. Rambach has developed it in a very convincing manner in a Whitsuntide sermon upon this text,[2] which, though bearing marks of deference to the prevalent taste of the age, is very vigorous. He further quotes for this view Triller, Untersuchung etlicher Oerter des N. T. i. 344; A. H. Francke's Pfingstprogramm von 1724; and J. E. Pfeiffer's Dissertation. Thus this exposition has not been without its favourers and advocates. Even Heumann adopted it at an earlier period, though he subsequently laid it aside again. Roos quietly expounds it in the same way as far as the *sense* is concerned, without any polemical object or any defence of its grounds: he obtains the same meaning by another construction and ellipse, in itself, however, open to the objection of being artificial:—"He who believeth in Me, *will find Me to be* what the Scripture

[1] Alford has recently protested against this, expresses his surprise that any one accustomed to the style of our Evangelist could for a moment suppose this construction possible, and characterises καὶ πινέτω ὁ πιστεύων as harsh beyond all example. After having renewed our investigations into the connection of the whole passage, we find the language and the meaning of this reading so imperatively required, that we are still constrained to the acceptance of a phraseology—nor is this without example—which is certainly singular. But it would be better to refute the strong grounds of our opinion, instead of adhering so tenaciously to the one objection of a harsh and strange phrase. We shall give further on our *reasons* for placing πινέτω at the beginning of the sentence, which makes, as we think, everything clear!

[2] See his Auserlesene heilsame Worte des Herrn Jesu. ii. Theil Jena 1731. S. 75. "Jesus als die Quelle der lebendigen Wasser."

has said *concerning the Messiah*." Die Lehre Jesu Christi, neue Aufl. S. 12, 118, where, in connection with this we find, S. 119, the thought hazarded that the Saviour would teach the Jews how to understand aright the meaning of the word *Messiah*—"He, from whom the Spirit proceeds." But whenever the learned commentators have occasion to mention this exposition, however obtained, of the αὐτοῦ, it is rejected immediately with some peremptory note of unsuitableness, without any attempt to prove the assertion.[1] I shall give my reasons *in its favour;* reasons which will have their force in proportion as my readers are disposed to deal faithfully and rigorously with the clear sayings of the Holy Word.

1. The *Scripture* declares invariably no other than that the Lord Himself will give the living water, and refresh His people with it: that from Him or (which is essentially the same) from His Temple (house, seat, congregation, body) the ποταμοί flow.[2] Hence Bengel's keen penetration into the Scripture cannot avoid referring the αὐτοῦ to the Messiah ("this is the fountain out of whose abundant flow believers receive"); but then he goes on to say:—"The believer is compared to the Lord Himself of believers, concerning whom the promise treats." Now this comparison is to our own mind exceedingly *unbiblical;* and it is a remarkable circumstance that greater exception has never been taken against a phraseology which would be without a parallel

[1] Nösselt (Opusc. iii.) institutes a false comparison with ch. xiv. 12, and would refute the above construction very summarily by saying that it is contrary to the context and to Greek usage—which says nothing. His inane interpretation of *doctrine* may indeed be said to be contrary to the context and to Greek usage. Münchmeyer thinks my exposition (not *mine*, however, distinctively) *harsh* in spite of its plausibility; but that is matter of taste. But when he lays stress upon the assertion that the receiving of the Holy Ghost is never exhibited by the figure drinking, one can hardly believe his own eyes. For is not this the case *here*, upon *any* supposition? Whence does the believer obtain those streams, ver. 38, but through the drinking of ver. 37, which again is substituted in ver. 39 by receiving?

[2] Even Sepp (iii. 53) is involuntarily driven to this most obvious thought, though without entering upon the exegetical problem: "Christ declares Himself to be the Temple of the New Covenant, *from which* the streams of living water flow *into* the heart of *every believer*, for the alleviation of all his thirst."

anywhere else in all the Scripture.[1] For there is a very different meaning in the passages (which Nösselt also quotes) Jer. xxxi. 12; Isa. lviii. 11, wherein the souls of the redeemed are likened to a garden rich in water (properly, watered, רָוֶה); or even Cant. iv. 15, where the bride (*i.e.* again the entire church!) is a well of living waters. Passages such as Prov. xvi. 22, xviii. 4 (which have also been alleged), employ a phraseology which is outside our present range, beyond the *prophetical* circle with which we here have to do. We found occasion to remark upon Jno. iv. 14 that it is not he who drinks that is said to become a spring, but only the water within him; the discourse there was not concerning any streaming forth upon others. Could the passage Isa. xii. 3 (to which the Lord must have referred in His mind) understand in מַעְיְנֵי הַיְשׁוּעָה—believers?? According to the usual reading He must almost necessarily have so interpreted it; yet in Rev. vii. 17 His Spirit explains it otherwise, speaking only, even in the fulness of consummation, of their being led to fountains of water. In Rev. xxi. 6 the Lord only gives to him that is athirst, of the fountain of the water of life which is His, which indeed is Himself; and in Rev. xxii. 1 the final stream proceedeth, as we might have expected, out of the throne of God and of the Lamb, but not from the Blessed themselves. And shall we *here* assume *streams* to flow from every individual *believer?* In the light of this general view of the analogy of Scripture, the words of our Lord and His quotation cannot to our minds be reconciled with the current interpretation attached to them.

2. But now, on the other hand, the κοιλία, which is too often overlooked, throws another critical element into the question. What does this signify in this place? It has been very generally assumed, and expositors have cried out with one common consent, that κοιλία like the Heb. בֶּטֶן or מֵעִים, is sometimes put for the inward parts, and so far the heart or the soul. This ob-

[1] Jul. Müller (Deutsche Zeitschrift 1850, 11) reposes calmly upon "this immeasurably great and blessed promise" given even to the "least" of believers, and seeks in it as an undertone the general truth, that the operation of the Spirit of Christ uses as its instrument the influence which men exert upon one another. This latter point may be admitted, so far as it goes; but *here* much more is said than merely that!

servation is very ancient,[1] and is continually applied without examination or challenge to this passage. In Wahl's Lexicon it stands—*ἐκ τῆς κοιλίας αὐτοῦ i. q. ἐξ αὐτοῦ.* Wesley interprets—his inmost soul. Van Ess translates—*aus dessen Innerstem!* from his inmost being. This application of the phrase may be conceded in many Old Test. passages,[2] although in none of them could קֶרֶב or נֶפֶשׁ be substituted simply. Let us look carefully, for example, at the distinction in Prov. xx. 27, where our modern Magnetism might point us to a right understanding of the חַדְרֵי־בֶטֶן. Compare again the same antithesis in Ps. xxxi. 10—נֶפֶשׁ in itself, and the corporeity penetrated by it. Even in such passages as Prov. xxii. 18 (of which there are scarcely any other) there is a similar reference. But how can we understand such a phraseology to be used in the New Testament without any occasion—*so material a figurative expression for the soul or inmost personality?*[3] This is the greatest difficulty of the common exposition, though it is generally passed over very lightly. Hence the various endeavours to find points of connection for it.[4] First it is sought, and rightly, in things from which water issues, and on which the comparison here certainly rests. But the belly of the urn or amphora with which the water was drawn is certainly inapplicable to the case, though Surenhus. and Schottgen, with Bengel, and Richter, following the Hirschb.

[1] On a very inappropriate passage, Job. xv. 35, and disturbing the entire *figure*, Olympiodorus says—*κοιλίαν, ὅλον τὸ ἐντὸς χωρίον φησί, καὶ αὐτὴν ψυχήν.* Gregor. Magn. fables:—quia, sicut *proles* in utero concipitur, sic cogitatio in *mente* generatur, et sicut in ventre *cibi*, ita continentur in mente cogitationes.

[2] Only let the quotations be cautious; and not, for example, Ecclus. xix. 12, where the bodily figure is plain enough, as is the allusion to Elihu's words; or Job xxxii. 18 itself! It is true that in Ps. xl. 9, בְּתוֹךְ מֵעַי appears to be almost equivalent to בְּלִבִּי—though we would not decide so quickly upon this point as Beck does (Bibl. Seelenlehre, S. 65), but think there is something distinctive in that passage.

[3] For all are willing enough to substitute "personality," even of those who cling to the old interpretation—comp. *e.g.* Nitzsch prakt. Theol. i. 172.

[4] From a feeling that it is insufficient in itself, and cannot stand alone. Hence we find Nösselt saying—"*κοιλία* is either *i.q.* animus like, מֵעַיִם, or (if this is not enough)—*pars pro toto homine!*"

Bibel adopted this view: for so petty a reference weakens the abounding idea of the ποταμοί. Therefore Hezel preferred the "*reservoir* of a spring." Gieseler comes nearer the mark (Stud. u. Krit. 1829 i. S. 138), when he elucidates it by ἐκ τῆς κοιλίας τοῦ ὄρους; von Gerlach follows him, and Olshausen should not think this too far-fetched, for, as the water which was drawn and poured out flowed through canals out of the mountain again, just so, according to the Scripture, should one day the water of life flow forth from the living temple.[1] Indeed, we do not altogether reject the reference supposed by Döpke[2] to the *rock* in the wilderness which gave forth water (which at the feast of Tabernacles would be obvious enough); inasmuch as in typical intimations like this the various types hint at each other and are blended together. Following this view v. Gerlach and v. Meyer cite 1 Cor. x. 4. But Döpke perceives more clearly than these others that that allusion would tend to strengthen the interpretation which refers the passage to *Christ Himself*. Suffice that the expression does assuredly contain "a reference to *corporeity*," to an actual receptacle in which the waters are contained and *from which* they come, in direct contradiction to Klee's arbitrary and bold assertion, that κοιλία is descriptive of that which is profoundly hidden and internal, in the very depths of the nature of spirit!! That which encloses and contains the water in the type, is, according to the Scripture, the temple and its mountain; which again must be regarded as that which the rock was in the wilderness—and in its fulfilment—?

3. But this corporeity, thus understood, is not to be regarded as the entire human personality of *every believer*, as the αὐτοῦ here distinctly individualises him! This would not indeed be *as* the Scripture hath said, but *against* its constant testimony where the streams of living water are spoken of. Even if we could regard an Apostle or any other mighty instrument or witness for God, as resembling Christ in being a source of spirit

[1] The fountain of Siloah, of which Olshausen thinks, did not spring from the temple-mountain, as we said above; and it has no applicability *here*, although chap. ix. 11 directs us to its significance as already existing in the Old Testament.

[2] S. 242, whom Hartmann follows—Enge Verbindung des A. T. mit dem Neuen, S. 641.

and life to others (though this is against the propriety of all Scripture, as we have seen)—yet even then we must shrink from asserting the same of every πιστεύων, who has just come himself to drink of that living stream, and must ever continue to drink.[1] We maintain that the Lord could never have intended to say *that*;[2] although many in all humility have so understood His words, without thinking of all the consequences of their interpretation. Augustine, for example, seems to feel the impropriety of representing the Holy Spirit as thus flowing from the believer, for he has chosen to extricate himself by reducing and enfeebling the meaning of the Evangelist's words:—Quid est fons et aqua viva? Benevolentia, qua vult consulere proximo? Baumgarten-Crusius takes away the essential spirit of the text when he interprets—"his soul will evermore derive from the depths of that fountain *refreshment* and *consolation!*" But is this exegesis? It may be something like the meaning of ch. iv. 14, but has nothing to do with this passage.

4. But now let us look at and understand *St John's authentic interpretation!* This spake He—*not* of the Spirit which His own, or His Apostles particularly, should pour forth, or communicate again to others—but which they that believe should *receive from Him.* It is of no importance whether the ἅγιον, rejected by Grotius, Mill, Bengel, Lachmann, and Tischendorf, be genuine or not; and Lücke's scruple, about the interpretation of the coming of the Spirit, springs from a view which does not scripturally understand either the ἔμελλον, or the οὔπω γὰρ ἦν, or the ἐδοξάσθη; and is consequently altogether ignorant of what St John and the entire New Testament mean by the Spirit first given by Jesus at the Pentecost. One is almost ashamed to point out to him that even the Old Testament speaks of the Spirit as water, and as water poured forth: Isa. xliv. 3 allows no hesitation on that point. But the difference between the New Testament Spirit

[1] Lücke:—That at the moment of believing the streams of living water begin at once to flow!

[2] Least of all to the people then before Him, from whom He desires a first coming that they might believe on His word; and so that, according to the Scripture, the stream of life might flow forth for them to drink as believers.

and the preparatory Spirit of the old covenant lies not merely in its greater fulness, nor even in its permanent indwelling; but, that which proceeds from the glorified God-man is on that account something specifically different and quite new, concerning which it might be said with perfect propriety before the glorification of Christ, "that it was not yet with us as a gift."[1] The *glorification* of the Lord is in truth not merely "the exhibition in all its clearness of the entire series of all His doctrines and miracles" (as Hezel says); but it is that perfect penetration by the Spirit, and that glorifying into Divinity, of His human nature, His flesh and blood, which was the fruit of His whole work of self-humiliation and redemption, both as His own reward and for our salvation; and which ch. vi. so amply expounded. Or can we suppose that the Evangelist here knew nothing of this truly mystical idea? Here, where according to the simplest view of the whole passage, and giving it all its grammatical and historical due, he most evidently makes it dependent upon this δοξάζεσθαι that as the Lord Himself said according to the Scripture, the promised streams *should* hereafter flow from His *body*, the true temple and the true rock! Let it be observed, moreover, how after the Resurrection the Lord in His final promise already shows by a symbolical action that He now breathed forth the Spirit which they were to receive. This has indeed a different meaning from that which Swedenborg, who so marvellously rationalises the mysteries of Scripture, says—the Divine in Christ flows forth from the human. This utterance holds good in all that fulness of meaning to which ch. vi. directed our thoughts. Triller (quoted by Rambach), rightly spoke of an aqua viva e *Christi corpore profluente.* His בֶּטֶן is in truth now the ὀχετὸς (as Hesych. interprets it), the independent spring as well as the imparting channel of the πνεῦμα, as all profound perception has admitted from the beginning;[2] the true πλήρωμα of which Jno. i. 16, after ver. 14 speaks, coinciding with Col. ii. 9, without any necessity for our distinguishing between the notions of St John and St Paul.

[1] Which is intended by the *gloss* δεδομένον, accepted by Lachmann and expressed in the old versions; as the δοθέν, ἐπ' αὐτούς, αὐτοῖς found their way into many MSS. as explanations.

[2] Irenæus spoke of Christ as πηγὴ τοῦ πνεύματος.

5. Finally, the arrangement of the words which we have preferred gives us the true gradation, which is sustained by practical experience, from thirsting to drinking,—as Rambach has well developed it in his sermon. The order of our salvation proceeds from *thirsting* as a condition in us; the *coming* is then the test of sincerity and earnestness in that *thirst.* In this coming, in this state of having come, *to Him*, *faith* first becomes sure and confirmed; and he only who is come to the fountain with full trust and confidence, can and will *drink* thereof.[1] This is then "the fourth or the lowest step, as it were, to the well of Divine grace, from which we draw and drink." Yes verily, the Lord places the πινέτω in emphatic opposition to the mere drawing and pouring out again, witnessed in the festal rite; from which the poor people went empty away. And therefore there belongs to this πινέτω a subject which is yet to be distinguished, to whom it is made a *promise.* That is, the *second* Imperative passes over, as it often does, into a promising Future. And if we thus understand it, we have finally—and what more can we say?—a reason given us in the true meaning, for the supposed harshness of the construction:—the πινέτω must come first, as being the *emphasis* of the promise, before the condition which follows it.

We would *paraphrase* the whole for further enforcement of our view. "Are there not then, among you joyous guests at this feast, any thirsting souls who are not satisfied[2] with all this ceremonial and typical procedure, this commemoration of ancient facts and wonders (the true meaning of which prophesied, however, of a great futurity), who long for righteousness, for Spirit and life? Whosoever feels this true thirst, let him now come—as long as I am with you this is My invitation—*unto Me!* With Me alone is the true water of life, soon *will I give it.* *Then* shall every one, who has become a believer in Me, *drink* to his full satisfaction, in a sense very different from your present beholding merely the water poured out. For, if the Scripture speaks of

[1] Believing and drinking are not *one and the same* here, any more than in ch. vi. It is not, as it has been translated—bibat eo ipso quod in me credat. We understand it very differently.

[2] Schleiermacher understands the Lord to say here:—he who thirsteth cannot satisfy himself by the memorials of old usages and ancient wonderful works of God.

streams of living water issuing forth from Jerusalem and the Temple—quite different from your well-meaning though petty drawing water from the valley, by which, however, ye are reminded of the prophetic word—that is spoken of Me and My body, My entire Person, and specially My humanity. In all those passages the Messiah was referred to, who is Myself, and it is as if it were said—The streams will flow out of *His* בִּטְנָן, to water the earth, and to give drink to the people."—And now we cannot but hope that all who are one with us upon the fundamental postulates of Scripture, will feel how natural and how necessary is St John's own comment upon this most mysterious saying (most expressly contrary, as it is, to the more recent exegesis, which admits no distinction between the life imparted to faith before, and that imparted after, the day of Pentecost) :—But this He spake (His εἶπε like the εἶπε of Scripture) as a promise and a prediction for the future; at that time some πιστεύοντες were called and collected together, but these and all believers who were afterwards added to them, *received* or drank afterwards the *streams of the Holy Ghost*, which through His *glorification* were *poured out* in abundance upon all who believed.[1]

The *results* of this first festival discourse of Jesus, both as it respects the common people and the rulers, are exhibited by the Evangelist in a succinct manner, and in their precise order. The contention among the people concerning Him becomes stronger, and the enmity of the rulers, still restrained from exhibition in act, becomes yet more manifest. Many of the people think that He is the Prophet, some think that He is the Messiah Himself; and ignorant that these mean one and the same, their misunderstanding confusedly contends. Others again oppose these latter on grounds which they deem irrefragable, since he is a Galilæan, and not from Bethlehem and of the seed

[1] I find, to my great satisfaction, that Steinmeyer has declared his approbation of the exposition here maintained (Beitr. zu Schriftv. ii. 123, 129.

of David.[1] The schemes of His enemies are still under restraint, but their enmity manifests itself all the more fiercely. And that in two ways: first directing itself against the unprejudiced testimony of the returning *officers*, and then provoked by the well-founded objection of *one of their own council* in their midst.

With a "marvellous admixture of fear and of courage" (as Teschendorff well says) these servants testify to the power of the words of this man, through the influence of which their hands had been restrained. But this is at once repelled with hateful scorn, though afterwards the shadow of an argument is adduced: they allege, to wit, the universal unbelief of the rulers, and contrast with them the ignorant populace, designated by an emphatic word of contumely which gives vent to the envenomed bitterness of their hearts. At that point Nicodemus quite unexpectedly answers both: for he shows that there is one ruler at least who dares to speak *for* Jesus, and that the people who attached themselves to Jesus did not thereby break the law, but rather the high council which condemned a man without hearing Him or investigating His *deeds!* This is gentle enough as an avowal of "believing in Him," but amply significant as referring to all His *works* (ch. iii. 2), and His equally memorable words; it is indeed a *well-grounded* objection in the mildest and most courteous form. But so evil-minded are these wicked men, that they repel their colleagues' words, even as they had those of the officers. First of all comes their hasty opprobrium, which stamps all intercession on His behalf as the abhorred connection itself. Here the wise and lofty rulers, having probably just found out this cry "of Galilee!" are at one with the ignorant and despised *mob*, ver. 41. When they add their reasoning upon the subject, and give what they think their valid reason (*search* in the Scripture, *look* in his life), their argument is altogether destitute of foundation, and blindly contradicts the most

[1] On many accounts Jesus did not lay open claim to descent from the entirely obscured lineage of David—among which Hess reckons His reference to His brothers. Can we suppose Him to have made His public appeal to that circumstance, and related everywhere His birth at Bethlehem?—He Himself aimed to awaken faith in quite another way, although these external circumstances would be of great service to sincere inquirers.

certain history—to say nothing of the Messianic prophecies in Isaiah.

HIS JUDGMENT CONCERNING THE ADULTERESS.

(Ch. viii. 7, 10, 11.)

Repeated and yet more distinctive discourses of our Lord now follow, in which He defends *His own testimony* to His Divine mission and its great ends, His human *sinlessness* and His Divine dignity; reproving more severely *than ever before* the *sin* and unbelief of His enemies. But these discourses which commence with ver. 12 of the eighth chapter, appeared to be prepared for by an occurrence of the early part of the day following the festival;[1] an occurrence which put the Pharisees especially to shame, and with which the discourses seem here and there to have points of connection.

And is this a mere illusion in the present text of our Gospel? Is the section of the woman taken in adultery St John's or not? A true tradition intercalated afterwards, or a mere apocryphal legend? We cannot evade giving our answer to this question, and will therefore, with reference to the design of this book, give it as concisely and clearly as possible:—concisely for the learned who have at their command the whole apparatus of disquisition on the subject; but clearly we hope for the unlearned who would desire to know our own opinion and its grounds.

The facts of the case, which give rise to contention, may be thus stated, without any bias or prejudice. Several manuscripts, and some of them very important, such as the Codex Vaticanus, are *without* the entire passage, chap. vii. 53–viii. 11. Some others have it with notes of suspicion or rejection. In others the entire section stands after chap. vii. 36—after chap. viii. 12—at the end of the Gospel—and even after Luke xxi. 38. It is *not* found, further, in the old versions:—not in the Peschito (at least in the ancient codd.), in the Philox. Syr. it is at least only doubtful, just so in the Copt. and Armen. ver-

[1] See how all hangs together through the links of ver. 30 and ch. ix. 1. But it was a Sabbath, ch. ix. 14.

sions, while the Gothic and Arabic (Sahidic) have no knowledge of it at all. And it was originally not noticed in Nonnus. Again, we have no reference to it in the fathers—Clemens Alex., Origen, Basil, Chrysostom, Cyril, Apollinaris, Theodore of Mops., and even Theophylact; among whom Origen, Chrysostom, and Theophylact are distinguished commentators upon this Gospel. Tertullian and Cyprian do not mention the history at least; and the interpreters in the Catena make no allusion to it. All this is historically true, and yet Lücke's expression is premature and too strong, that this section first became an integral portion of St John's Gospel in the fourth or fifth century. It would be more correct to say cautiously, instead, that it often is wanting before the time of Ambrose, Jerome, and Augustine. For it must on the other side be acknowledged as an authority which has a retrospective validity, when we read in Jerome adv. Pelag. lib. 2 cap. 17:—in *multis* et græcis et latinis codd. *invenitur* locus de adulterâ muliere etc., and when we find some Scholia appealing to ἀρχαῖα ἀντίγραφα in its favour. Even the Ital. and Vulg., and the Apost. Const. (I. 2. 24) have a knowledge of this narrative;[1] and according to the testimony of Eusebius (III. 39) there was even in the Εὐαγγέλιον καθ' Ἑβραίους a passage extant, which can hardly be any other than this. Finally, it deserves to be carefully observed, that there was afterwards an almost universal adoption of the section into the Gospel of St John; and among the numerous codd. (more than two hundred) which contain it, is the important Cantabrigiensis, which once had weight as the representative of the κοινὴ ἔκδοσις. Thus the historical result which lies before us, *so far as our already discovered materials reach*, is the remarkable fact which demands explanation—that in very early times the narrative of the adulterous woman was either wanting in the Gospel of St John, or was found in a different place. If no preconceived view affects our decision of the question, and no critical bias disturbs our condemnation of it, no more than this can be assumed, or need be acknowledged.

[1] And this is of no small moment, even if it is reckoned an interpolation, in establishing its early existence and recognition, and the tradition which handed it down, even though not decisive for the passage as originally in St John.

We are not disposed to attach any importance to the fact that the Cod. Alex. is generally included among the Manuscripts which omit the section; for, it is generally defective, and exhibits a chasm[1] of the whole of this Gospel, from ch. vi. 50 to ch. viii. 53; nor to its omission in the defective Cod. Ephræmi which similarly leaves out the whole from ch. vii. 3 to ch. viii. 34: it is more to our purpose to show that its exclusion in many of the fathers cited above, or their silence concerning it, may be accounted for on various grounds. For the sake of brevity, however, we appeal to the decision of Ebrard, who is no unconscientious critic,—"the external testimonies *against* its genuineness are altogether *insignificant*." Now though Olshausen or any other should aver the investigation to be settled and closed, the case is not so utterly hopeless if there is any room for such a critical assurance as that.

The immense *variety of various readings* (arranged as they have been in three main recensions of the text), would necessarily be the result of the uncertain and capricious nature of the question, and are less an argument against the section, than a concomitant circumstance. The question *wherefore* the narrative has been omitted or displaced, was answered pertinently enough by Augustine and Ambrose:—That a fear of misunderstanding or abuse or an ascetic scruple concerning its morality, induced men to ignore the very remarkable absolution of so gross a sinner. They who are not contented with this, place themselves under an obligation to answer a preliminary question of still more significance—whence and upon what ground did any ever presume to *interpolate* in the Gospel of St John *such* an unauthorised and unattested narrative? Klee says boldly that "it is, generally speaking, easy enough to account for its absence in many of the Codd., if it had been originally in the text; but the converse is utterly unaccountable, how it should ever have crept in, if it had never been there."[2]

[1] The relation of the *space* of this chasm, as to whether it would be sufficient to have contained this section, is hardly to be decided. But we may with Ebrard deduce from the chasm as appearing in three other Codd., that "consequently the matres here read the section, which the copies *ventured to omit*."

[2] Or "this narrative has so much in its favour, that it might be a hun-

But let this be enough, as our book does not profess to enter into critical disquisition, to show that we do not form our decision without adequate perception of the true conditions of the question. What shall we say more? Even Lücke, one of the most determined opponents of the passage,[1] refers the verdict to the instance of *internal* criticism, and sums up the whole in terms not stronger than these: "*documental* criticism has ample reason, if not for denying the Johannæan authenticity of the section, yet at least for doubting it in a high degree. Internal criticism gives absolute sentence against its genuineness."[2] Now this is enough for us! Lücke finds as the result of subjective internal criticism that "the phraseology and manner of narration are not St John's, the contents are harsh and improbable, the connection with chap. vii. 52 neither exegetically nor historically clear"—but *we* may be permitted to give *another* result as approved by exposition.

For, we are in fact not so compliant as to content ourselves with its mere *historical truth*, which might, however, consist with its spuriousness in St John's Gospel. The narrative in itself was assuredly not such as could have been invented, it exhibits no trace of having been apocryphal, betrays no marks whatever of fiction; on the contrary it is throughout, and especially on the stooping down and writing upon the ground, as original as it is in harmony with the spirit and mind of Jesus. If any man fails to discern *that*, we most confidently deny to him the capacity of estimating the value of internal criticism in matters that pertain to Scripture. Hence many of those who oppose its authenticity in St John attribute it to a well-grounded and genuine tradition. Even Hezel cries out in his enthusiasm, upon ver. 7:—"Yes, in this saying the true and undoubted spirit of Jesus breathes!" Lange too confidently assigned the occurrence to the dubious questions in the last week, induced by its arrangement after Lu. xxi. 38; though he afterwards (iii. 622) determined to treat it in its true position in

dred times omitted through all kinds of scruples, rather than have been once admitted in its true character if spurious." So Rennecke, die Lehre vom Amt der Schlüssel, Malchin, 1845, S. 28.

[1] With whose decision Alford is inclined to coincide.

[2] To which Semler also appealed for his argument against it.

St John because it seemed to him to harmonise well with the feast of Tabernacles. Olshausen (whose dry pertinacity in many particulars we are well acquainted with) stands almost alone among the orthodox in adhering to an unqualified suspicion of its historical truth. The entire body of the several difficulties which he has alleged, and which are designedly placed in the strongest possible light, will be softened away in our subsequent exposition.

We hold, and hold fast with the utmost confidence, the assurance that this contested section is St John's.[1] All that has been brought forward in disproof, fails to convince us of the contrary. The *phraseology* which has been detected to be foreign to St John's, admits of various explanation. It is partly found in those ἅπαξ λεγόμενα which, it is well known, often mock criticism, and are to be found in every section of Scripture which deals with a distinctive subject (ἀναμάρτητος, εἷς καθεῖς, ὄρθρου, καθίσας, πᾶς ὁ λαός);—it may in part be the result of that variation in the text which has been the singular fate of this passage (such as the frequent δέ instead of St John's οὖν);—and for the rest it is simply of no importance, as in the case of the πορεύεσθαι and παραγίνεσθαι with εἰς, or when the γραμματεῖς of the Synoptics are introduced—one cannot see why they should not[2]—or that St John should record that

[1] Euthymius expressed his suspicion, grounded upon the MSS. only with a διὸ φαίνονται παρέγγραπτα καὶ προσθήκη. Erasmus, Calvin, and Beza, lightly doubted. Then we have as opponents, more and more decided—Grotius, Clericus, Wetstein, Semler, Griesbach, Paulus, Wegscheider, Schulz, Tittmann, Schott, Knapp, Lachmann, de Wette, Feilmoser, Credner, Hase, Meyer, Hitzig, Tholuck, Olshausen, Bleek, Lücke, Neander, Wieseler, Lange, Luthardt. Yet Lücke returns to the original expression—"that the Johannæan authenticity *appears* to be irretrievably lost." Among its defenders stand (not to mention the treacherous Schulthess) since Lampe, Mill, Whitby, Heumann, Bengel, Michaelis, Matthäi, Scholz, Hug, Klee, Storr, Dettmers, Staüdlin, Kuinoel, and most recently Ebrard. (Hitzig on the ground of a special hypothesis.) Niemeyer also, in the Charakteristik (Neue Aufl. i. 329), maintains most confidently from internal evidence the Johannæan genuineness of the narrative.

[2] Baumgarten-Crusius, who does not decide rightly, himself reminds us here that "there is indeed no other narrative in St John of that kind of *legal questioning* which belonged especially to the γραμματεῖς." Brückner tries in vain to invalidate this by a weak allusion to ch. 5.

Jesus *taught* without specifying *what*—forgetting the strict parallel of ch. vii. 14. Much also has been said of the general lack of reference and point, of the interruption of the connection, and of the unnatural, disjointed sequence of the narrative. We shall see hereafter that ch. vii. 53–ch. viii. 2, must in any case be genuine, and that *this* connection must be established at the outset. But then the πάλιν λαλεῖν of ver. 12 will badly connect itself with the ἐδίδασκεν, while ver. 2 has the appearance of explaining the scene of a specific and new occurrence. Is it not strictly in the manner of St John, to append continuous discourses to occurrences which gave occasion for them, and form their substratum, as we find in chs. v. and vi., and again afterwards in chs. ix. and x.? And is not the woman's sin strictly in harmony with the unbridled pleasure of the festival, which furnished occasion for many such like excesses? Still more, we find throughout the eighth chapter a distinctively heightened animosity of His opponents—quite natural after the shame put upon them in the early morning. Even if we should not concur with Bengel in discerning an allusion in the walking in darkness to the sin of adultery (but why not?)—yet the allusion in vers. 15, 16 (I judge no man, My judgment is true) is so palpable and obvious, that some of our more recent critics strangely enough reverse the matter. Weisse thinks that the narrative was *very aptly* interpolated as a comment upon ver. 15; and Lange adduces the same thing as a motive for its insertion in this place! This is ample testimony that such a reference *really exists*. Yet, again, how *natural* is the strong and emphatic reproof of vers. 21, 24, after this occurrence—Ye shall *die* in your *sins!* Have not the holy zealots been constrained to acknowledge themselves as sinners under the same condemnation of death! Finally, it is incomprehensible to my simple eye, that any *believing* critic should have failed to take into his consideration the significant contrast between ver. 7 and ver. 46 of the same chapter. He, before whom no man dared to declare himself ἀναμάρτητος, asks on the self-same day—Which of you convinceth Me of any ἁμαρτία? In fact, this one most simple trait of sublime connection, so entirely in harmony with St John's whole exhibition of the Holy One in the midst of an evil world, throws a hundredfold weight into

the conviction that the history of the adulteress was not afterwards patched into the Gospel by unwarranted hands.

Many manuscripts which omit the following narrative, yet contain ch. vii. 53, and ch. viii. 1, 2; and those critics who have hence declared these verses at least to be genuine (Wieseler among the last) seem to us to view the matter more correctly than those who find in them nothing but difficulty and embarrassment. For to make the πάλιν οὖν ἐλάλησε of ch. viii. 12 follow immediately upon ch. vii. 52, without any transition or historical introduction to a new scene—as Luthardt does to our surprise—appears in the highest degree foreign to the manner of St John; to establish this we have only to refer to the Apostle's constant wont in his transitions, and his customary method of giving a narrative setting to every new discourse. We find in this a tolerably plain indication that the section was not originally interpolated, but that it had been omitted; it appears to us as if this omission had begun now here and now there, and that the omission of these three verses with the rest was the result of inconsideration and misapprehension. It is often but uselessly questioned whether in ver. 53 the Sanhedrim or the common people is intended. As we simply read it, the ἕκαστος includes all the people, but pre-eminently indicates the members of the council; for some result of their stratagem and treachery we naturally expect as an inevitable conclusion. But the Evangelist, in his pregnant manner, gives a formula which explains the internal procedure by the external, and seems to say that the whole came to *no* result, that there followed no new command to take Jesus, and so forth; but that their business being unaccomplished, and their designs so far abortive, all (on that day, that is, the day last mentioned, ver. 37) disbanded and were broken up, the high council and the common people. The words do not refer to any departure of the strangers.

Εἰς τὸν οἶκον has been regarded as a phrase not used by St John, and indeed some Codd. have εἰς τὰ ἴδια, but it may well be allowed to stand for once to strengthen the contrast, that Jesus who had no *house* either in Jerusalem or anywhere, went

to the Mount of Olives.[1] The return of the people in the interval to the inert quiet and security of their dwellings at the conclusion of the feast, is intended to be contrasted with our Lord's, as it were, homeless way of spending the short night, who is early in the morning on the scene again. One cannot well see why what is recorded in Lu. xxi. 37, 38 may not now even thus early have taken place; it might have been the Lord's ordinary custom from the beginning to leave the brilliant misery of the city every night, that so He might compose His sorrowful and interceding heart, and collect His energies for new labours of love; preferring for his resting-place Bethany and the *Mount of Olives*, the scene thus consecrated by many preparatory prayers for His final humiliation and exaltation. But that criticism, which has not sufficient simplicity of faith to interject and interline such gracious hintings of the Holy Ghost, finds itself at a loss in this pregnant and comprehensive statement.[2]

The Lord has determined, as everything here shows, to oppose His enemies openly and persistently; and, as the Light of the world, to accomplish that which His brethren desired, but in His own way. He knows that His hour to suffer in silence is not yet come, and that their hour to hear is not yet past. Therefore, after all that had past, He is early at His post, with equanimity and zeal still continuing to *teach*.[3] He comes first, then come naturally all the people to Him. If the previous day had been the last of the proper feast, it must not be supposed from that, or deduced from ver. 53, that *all* the pilgrims at the feast had come back into the country again, and that the temple would be left *empty* after such a festal week. The very suspense as to whether Jesus would remain, would keep many back; and

[1] Alford's objection, that "John never elsewhere mentions the Mount of Olives" (not even in ch. xviii. 1), has no weight. If the text is otherwise approved, our simple answer, without any suspicion or wonder, is—that St John here alone mentions the Mount of Olives. [Stier omits all allusion to this habit of the Evangelist (that of giving explanations when he introduces new places) which *alone gives weight* to my remark. Alford 2nd Edit.]

[2] We shall find on ch. x. 22 a further elucidation and justification of this remark.

[3] It is just because this is the meaning, that nothing is said of the contents of His instruction—as at ch. vii. 14.

when it was said that He was already in the temple again, a concourse was soon gathered. Λαός instead of ὄχλος probably was used to suggest a diminution of the number, since it was no longer composed of the masses who attended the feast; this expression, further, is rather descriptive of Israel in whose presence their Messiah was speaking, and with a certain contrast to the subsequent Scribes and Pharisees. Compare in this Gospel ch. xi. 50, xviii. 14. They whom those had scornfully designated ὁ ὄχλος οὗτος, St John here mentions designedly with a more appropriate designation.

It is clear that those who brought the woman into the Lord's presence are neither the legal Judges (the three-and-twenty who, then holding their session, left their seats and came to Jesus, as Hess, Pfenninger, and others suppose), nor zealots who interpose in the matter. On the former supposition, it is incomprehensible that they should have remitted the question to Jesus as a higher tribunal, and that they should afterwards have set free the guilty person at His instance; and it is equally inexplicable that Jesus should have rendered the execution of the law dependent upon the innocence of its ministers. He terms them, indeed, in ver. 10, accusers and not judges. And by the so-called zealot-law, in itself a very questionable point, they must at once without any delay have stoned the woman. Consequently, we must regard them as private individuals of the learned caste who had made themselves extemporary accusers, having heartily entered into the scandal, and regarding the occurrence as a welcome opportunity for laying a snare in the presence of the people, to entrap the Lord. For *that*, as Ebrard well remarks, was just the question at first, whether they should adopt a judicial procedure, and take the legal course with the woman, or not. Lange thinks it improbable "that the Pharisaic party should have even in appearance constituted Him a theocratic judge, at the very time when they were holding a session (were thought to be holding) in order to effect His capture; and were adopting every possible expedient to lower Him in the estimation of the people." Quite right, if they had been consistent and thoughtful and cautious in their enmity; but the Evangelist has described them otherwise, as we might obviously have supposed. The poor woman must be made a handle of, that they may pursue the suddenly con-

ceived suggestion of their malicious hearts, and involve the Lord in entanglement and shame; whether this device might be frustrated does not enter their thoughts, for their excited frenzy pauses not to think.

Διδάσκαλε—thus courteously do they address the Lord, as then sitting in the seat of instruction. "*This woman* now standing in the midst was taken in the very act[1] of adultery, and Moses in the law commanded *us* (Israelites generally) to stone *such*"—thus is the case stated without any obscurity. Here is the major and minor of the proposition, and then for the conclusion comes the hasty question—But what sayest *Thou?* But before we notice the element of temptation in this question, we are met by an objection to the authenticity of this narrative strangely derived from the difficulty of reconciling the stoning with the law of Moses. This difficulty is indeed forced upon the passage, it does not really exist; we might simply appeal to the Mos. Recht of Michaelis and his father's dissertation,[2] where the matter is perfectly settled. In Lev. xx. 10, and Deut. xxii. 22, we do indeed read only of death; but in the latter chapter, vers. 21 and 24, we find "stoning" literally prescribed for some specific cases. Even if this points to a *distinction* in the punishment in the several cases (which we cannot suppose, as there could be no reason why the betrothed woman, as such, should be more severely punished), yet we may well suppose that those who were then speaking would not bear in mind the accurate distinction; or, as Lampe says, it might have been intimated by the τοιαύτας that this was one of the cases for which stoning was prescribed. We are convinced, however, with Michaelis, our scribe in the Mosaic law, that Moses, who only recognises two kinds of death—stoning and the sword—intended the former for every species of adultery. The later rule of the Talmud, though earlier in the Mischna,[3] that wherever מות simply is expressed,

[1] Ἐπαυτοφώρῳ is the terminus forensis, referring originally to theft (Hesych. ὁ ἐπ' αὐτῷ τῷ κλέμματι εὑρεθεὶς, ἔτι κατέχων αὐτό), but subsequently and in a wider signification. Philo (see in Lampe) uses the same expression for the sin of adulteresses. The man indeed departs, and, as generally happens, escapes free.

[2] De pœnis capitalibus in sacrâ scripturâ commemoratis.

[3] Hence also Pseudo-Jonathan on Lev. xx. 10.

strangulation, the easiest kind of death, is to be understood, is altogether foreign to the law of Moses, which knows nothing of strangulation as a judicial punishment. It is perfectly plain to all who are not disposed to be captious, that the מוֹת יָמוּת must, according to its connection and general usage, be no other than stoning. Michaelis admirably supports this position by his perfectly sound interpretation of the strictly analogous passages in Ex. xxxi. 14, xxxv. 2, compared with Numb. xv. 32–35. The ancient custom of burning, obviously only the dead body, which occurs in Gen. xxxviii. 24, has nothing to do with this matter. But Ezek. xvi. 38, 40, xxiii. 47, are again quite decisive for the "law of adulteresses" in general; nor is there anything "uncertain or obscure" to us in their allusion. And Kimchi's much-appealed-to note, in which only the לֹא שַׁיְמִיתוּהָ can be urged, actually presupposes the רָגַם בָּאֲבָנִים as the מִשְׁפַּט הַמְנָאֲפוֹת; and only designs to explain how in addition to the stoning the death by the sword was intended. This single passage, constantly appealed to, should be understood by the preliminary words in ver. 38 (which scarcely any one has referred to); upon which the same Kimchi gives a disquisition upon the שְׁנֵי מִשְׁפָּטִים, that of the adulteress, and that of the woman who shed blood. Jerome's assumption, finally (on Jer. xxix. 22, 23), that stoning was the death mentioned in the history of Susannah, is well-founded, though it is not so expressly mentioned in our Greek text. We close this matter by adopting an observation of Baumgarten-Crusius, that stoning was the only current *Jewish* punishment of death (although it might be unjudicial); for which he appeals to Acts vii.

Moses commanded *us*, who are now under the compulsory bondage of the Romans, to punish such culprits thus:—in this we have already[1] an intimation that the decision for which they asked was not one self-evident, and that their inquiry was not uncaptious. Olshausen, who is disposed at last to discern in the πειράζειν merely a "well-meaning desire to gain information," has strangely entangled himself in the presumed difficulty which

[1] Besides a perfectly harmonious explanation of the difficulty generally found in ἡμῖν.

is alleged. If Jesus exonerated the woman, as they expected from this *friend of sinners* whose mildness they knew, and whose many sayings concerning publicans and harlots they had heard, then would He, the *Messiah*, contradict the *law* of Moses, which assuredly it should be His duty to sustain *against the* Romans, and which they therefore expressly mentioned first. But if He yielded His assent, and bade them go and stone her, He would commit again a *twofold* offence. In the first place, He would (as Ebrard says) "offend against the laxity of morals, and the general moderation of the age,"[1] and thus make Himself by His new rigour hateful to the people, especially as deviating from His general gentleness; but we would not press this too much, for it is not the main consideration. He would offend, as His words would be maliciously interpreted, against the Roman prerogative to decide upon every sentence of death, whether legal in the law of Moses, or not. The Romans did not punish adultery by death, and even though they might allow validity to the country law of the provinces, yet both their practice and that of the Jews had become most negligent and careless upon this offence. All is perfectly harmonious, when these crafty ones hypocritically bring their embarrassment to the solution of His wisdom, as if the miserable woman excited their pity on the one hand, and on the other hand they attributed to Him a judicial authority over Moses. But what sayest Thou? Wilt Thou in Thy well-known benevolence take her into Thy protection, and publicly maintain Thy opposition to Moses? Or wilt Thou counsel such rigorous justice as is now generally disused, and found among so many sins impracticable? Finally, what is Thy utterance upon this case, one of many constantly recurring, in which we come into collision with our Gentile rulers—what sayest Thou as Messiah on *that question?* This last is undoubtedly the pith of the whole. And now looking back, is there anything incomprehensible or unhistorical in all this?

The Lord, in His wisdom and sublime repose, opposes to their impetuosity a *silent* though eloquent reply; that their thoughts and their consciences might recover their composure, before He

[1] Comp. upon this Sepp. iii. 64, according to whose account even the application of the test of the bitter water which caused the curse (Numb. v.) had been abolished.

expressly uttered anything with His lips. He stoops down, as He *sits*,[1] and writes with His finger εἰς τὴν γῆν, upon the *ground*, delineating letters upon the dust or upon the stone. This is certainly, as most expositors say, first of all, an "expression of indifference or disregard."—He acts as if inwardly pondering, and unconscious of their presence. Similar demeanour in similar circumstances may be paralleled by many remarkable passages in the classic writers. But we would not say that it was "a gesture of most supreme indifference;" nor can we allow that as exhibited by our God it could be "a *mere* expression of repulsion, of indifference, of determination not to reply." If the Lord adopts any such expedient He attaches to it a deeper significance, and we adopt the note of Meyer—"but this demeanour had probably a profound meaning." If the questioners understood it, as they indeed might, at first—"He will not engage with us in the matter;"—or even—"He must first reflect upon it, and ponder awhile"—yet would the writing upon the ground soon give *them* something to ponder, and *speak* to their reflection. We will not revive here the tasteless and crude speculations which have been hazarded upon this writing of Christ,[2] or upon *what* He might be supposed to have written;[3] but we may say at once, that in common with most thoughtful people, we discern in it something *profoundly suggestive*, a preparatory reply hinted to His interrogators in act. And this mute hieroglyphic is so various and manifold in its suggestion, that we can only do justice to its full meaning by exhibiting the individual possible meanings in their progression, leaving to every one to choose for himself that which approves itself to his mind.

But we must preliminarily reject the notion of Michaelis as too trite and unmeaning an interpretation:—"It is already written in your law, as ye yourselves say; wherefore then put the question to Me?"[4] Rather than this, it would seem more

[1] Mark, once more, the connection between ver. 2 and ver. 6.

[2] Among which we do not reckon Bengel's saying—Once did God write in the Old Testament; once Christ in the New. Reflect upon the parallel of the Law and the Judgment!

[3] Scarcely the answer given in the 7th verse, as Sepp confidently explains!

[4] More severely must we condemn the marvellous notion that Christ

natural to expound it—God has written other things than that both in His law and in your consciences! It is significant that He writes Himself, and the interpretation has been carried further—"I also can write, even as Moses could!" (Jo. Rupert.) If that sounds too striking, it may be varied thus—"Ye bring this sinful woman before My bar—ye know not, and will not believe it, but it is nevertheless true, that before My judgment-seat all persons will finally come, and every question be finally adjudicated. How, what, and on what principles, I judge, is already written, is already recorded!" Reference has been here found to the books, Rev. xx. 12. The Old-Testament expression also obviously occurs to the mind, that those who departed from God should be written in the earth. (Jer. xvii. 13. This, however, not simply meaning, as Hitzig thinks, the passing away into forgetfulness, like those who are blown away as dust; but expressing a significant contrast to the name being written before God in heaven.) Or we may give the thought this turn:—"If this floor of the temple, if this whole land, could speak—what would it record concerning all of you, and what would still have to be recorded of you!" And this gives a very pertinent meaning; comp. Isa. xxvi. 21; Job xvi. 18.[1] Stoop down, rather, with Me, and read the sin of your whole people, and of all mankind—this is the first and best thing that you can do, when such an offence is perpetrated. Finally, this leads us back again into the most general interpretation:—"Oh, how much could I say concerning you, how much could I reveal and condemn, which I would rather now bury in silence—constrain Me not to speak!" Thus, as Baumgarten-Crusius says, this gesture almost intimates what is afterwards said—*τί με πειράζετε, ὑποκριταί*; and this "Let Me rather keep silence!" coincides most simply with that first intimation—"The matter concerns Me not, I will know nothing of it judicially!" *This*, which is

would here give them to understand that the Mosaic law was abolished! "Could He have *kept silence* if He had believed in the continued validity of the Old Testament and its writings?" So Hugo in his Predigtsammlung!!

[1] But not with any more specific allusion—the woman's sin is an *earthly* offence, not pride. For the writing applied to the *complainants*; and the ground points to the abyss to which pride is referred back.

assuredly the most obvious meaning of His act, is vindicated by the repetition of the same gesture after the brief utterance which He gave. Only we must hold fast this, as the kernel of the paradox, that the Lord, even while He seems to decline all interference, designs to reveal to them, at the same time, His own secret knowledge and judgment, with respect to which there is no sin and no guilt which does not most deeply concern Himself.[1]

The most ancient interpretation was expressed in the gloss, which some MSS. contain, of *προσποιούμενος* or also *μὴ προσποιούμενος* (*αὐτούς*): but this in itself is hard to be explained. As *προσποιεῖσθαι* generally bore the meaning of *simulare*, this would seem to intimate no more than that He did *not* actually write anything;[2] or conversely, that He *did* actually write. But we might (with Baumgarten-Crusius) explain it, according to the same meaning of the word, that He did *not* appear *as if He heard;* or, appearing *as if He heard not.*[3] Further, as *προσποιοῦμαι* also signifies—I assume, arrogate to myself, Bengel interprets it—id negotii ad se nil pertinere significans. And this we should be inclined on the whole to prefer.

Ver. 7. But when, probably after a fitting pause, during which the attention of the waiting people must have been stimulated to the highest pitch of eagerness, the tempters persisted in demanding His reply, the Lord gave it to them like a peal of thunder in their ears! If they had interpreted His silent writing as a mark of absence, how fearfully were they surprised! But that seems scarcely credible; we may say with more probability that with "beating hearts" they insist upon the answer, in order to preserve their consistency before the people. How must their hearts have throbbed now, when with one little word of sacred severity He rends their snares, and turns themselves to confusion! They would terrify and entangle Him with *the law*, when they unseasonably and perversely endeavoured to extract from Him one of His judicial decrees against a gross and public delinquency. With the same law the Lord connects His

[1] According to a clause added to ver. 8, He wrote *ἑνὸς ἑκάστου τὰς ἁμαρτίας.*

[2] So Euthymius: *προσεποιεῖτο γράφειν εἰς τὴν γῆν.*

[3] Euthymius proceeds: *καὶ μὴ προσέχειν οἷς ἔλεγον.*

answer, yet adds something to it in His supreme authority, which was derived from the inmost spirit of the whole law, and thus approves its propriety to their own consciences. According to Deut. xvii. 7, it was the right and duty of the *witnesses* to cast the first stone (comp. Acts vii. 57)—and of this prescription the Lord reminds them by *τὸν λίθον*. But He does not expressly presume that those who brought the woman and the complaint were actually the witnesses, for that was not specially contained in their *κατειλήφθη*; but He *substitutes* another meaning of the law, as unexpected as it was convicting. Ye act as if the law of Moses, that such should be stoned, was not addressed simply to the appointed judges, but to all the people, and, therefore, also to you: then will ye at once take precedence in its execution? I have nothing to say against that, but to impose the little condition, which before God is *inexorable* in the case of all *self-assumed* complaining, condemning, and punishing—that ye yourselves be not in the same condemnation! The Lord lays it down in the broadest way:—there may be *one*, though it be but one, among you *without sin;* let him cast the first stone, and then may the others follow him! What severity against these miscreants, who were even then probably feeding their eyes upon the woman as she stood there, in the apparent admission and concession of this reply! May not this, too, be called *Irony?* These hypocritical holy ones have spoken from their serene elevation of *τὰς τοιαύτας*,—the Holy One does not let this pass, but asks them with the gentle but deeply piercing word—Are not *ye* actually *such?* He takes care not to say:—he who is not such as she, who is without *this* or *similar* sin—although this was included;—such an appeal is seldom understood, and for the most part misapplied. He says in the most general term *ἀναμάρτητος*, "without sin," for sin in the strongest sense is ever the same; and He takes occasion to say, for all future time, a word which was designed to exert an eternal influence upon men's judgments. He gives the simplest and most elevated utterance to a truth which all men feel to be true, that *no one sinner may dare to condemn another*, intruding upon the sole prerogative of God, exercising with a human will His own authority. (Rom. ii. 1.) We cannot but think, in connection with this, of that yet more horrible adultery of which unfaithful Israel had been guilty

against their God; and may consider that the Lord (as in Matt. xxii. 21) pointed to the fundamental sin of the people also, as the reason that the judicial sentence of Moses had not remained in acknowledged exercise. But all this is our own deduction from the Lord's words, such as may indeed have risen to the minds of those who first heard them, in their subsequent meditation: at the time itself the great matter to them was the answer, which repelled the unauthorized haste of their complaint, and held up to their view their own sinfulness.

So that they could not charge Him with invading either the law of Moses, or the prerogatives of the Romans: *themselves*, indeed, He had very closely touched. They were now neither the Judges nor the witnesses called before the bar, but private persons answering for themselves. Thus while He detracts nothing from the typical warning law of condemnation, but rather most earnestly points to its authority as *Divine* and not resting upon sinful man,[1] He treats the case presented to Him in a manner which their folly little calculated upon, neither juristically nor politically, but as a διδάσκαλος from the universal moral point of view.[2] His word is so simple, so obviously true and self-intelligible, drawn so directly from the depths of man's consciousness of right, of that law written in the conscience which is the foundation of all positive ordinances, that we might suppose that every man might have seen its propriety or uttered the like. And yet He alone has spoken such a saying in all its sublime simplicity of conviction! For while He disclaims all earthly judicial functions, He in the same words exercises His office as the present Searcher of hearts, and the future Judge of all: nor did He utter a word before He had by His mysterious writing made deep allusion to the secrets which were known to Himself. With what absolute knowledge of man's being does He first prepare their hearts, before He pronounces the words which penetrate and pierce those hearts! Who can tell whether these

[1] Roos' remark is quite inappropriate—For adulterers to condemn adulterers is a justice which stinks in the nostrils of Jehovah!

[2] As Neander says:—He takes the sin out of the domain, foreign to His function, of external judicature, into His own distinctive province of morality. And Olshausen's fourth objection as to the invasion of official forms of judgment is abundantly refuted.

presumptuous ones, if He had given them this appeal as the immediate answer, would not have begun to discuss and try to moderate the meaning of "without sin"—even like our modern expositors? But now, in the solemn stillness brought to some kind of consciousness and reflection, they are incapable of anything but dumb surprise, they justify the words, and go away profoundly abashed. The Lord stooped down once more, and left it *for them* to decide whether they would cast the first stone or not. *He* had not expressly accused any one of *them*. But accused and convinced by their *consciences*,[1] to which the Lord's word had made so solemn an appeal, they utter their silent though sufficiently loud, avowal of their own guilt. Olshausen enumerates this susceptibility of the Pharisaic heart as one of his historical difficulties; but we take leave to say that their consciences are aroused by the power of the word of Jesus. There are not wanting instances enough, in which men only relatively pure have had power to call up a sudden response to their earnest words even in the hardest and most malignant hearts—but what was the Divine power which went forth with the voice of the all-holy Son of God at this hour! There was, moreover, in His plain and calmly spoken word, such a tone of absolute truth, and accompanied by a glance of such searching judgment, that neither a Caiaphas nor a Judas could have withstood it. He did not continue to fix His eyes upon them, being very far from desirous to take pleasure in their humiliation before the people, but rather being grieved that their ἐπιμένειν had enforced from Him this revelation. But all their daring is gone —no man presumes to declare himself without sin—many a man is fearing lest, by answering Him a single word, a second and more fearful thunderstroke should fall upon himself, in the incontrovertible and yet more specific revelation of his own secret shame. Suffice that they gradually steal away, one after the other, and even the eldest or most elevated first. Nothing is said of a "withdrawal in formal order." The *eldest* have weightier burden on their consciences; and it would be quite in keeping with St John's phraseology if we *so* understood the

[1] Thus the connection of profound meaning gives its sanction to this clause, which is sometimes omitted.

πρεσβύτεροι, comp. 2 Jno. 1, 3 Jno. 1.[1] Nor is this opposed by the ἕως τῶν ἐσχάτων (doubtful also in itself), for this, as Klee pertinently says, belongs properly to the ἀρξάμενοι—till the last were gone out. The words do not specify a departure of the *whole people*, as Fikenscher thinks; but the woman remains ἐν μέσῳ before the people, as previously, ver. 3. The μόνος refers manifestly only to the accusers; describes *Jesus* as the only one with whom the sinner had now to do, and whose sentence upon *her* was now waited for by all.

That the adulteress continued to stand there, instead of stealing away also as in decorum bound, is of itself intimation enough of that *penitent feeling* which expositors have generally lost sight of, and which the Lord's word to her not only *presupposes* but *proves*. The anguish of death is past, but the bitterness of conscience is almost stronger than that. Alas, the poor woman had been driven by a very different thirst from that of which Jesus spoke in the feast, into the slough where His mercy now finds her! What will He say unto her? Is He also not without sin? Will He, who, in His first word, mentioned the first *stone* of Moses' obligation, now in His final adjudication contradict Moses—or confirm his decree? She stands and awaits her doom.

Vers. 10, 11. We might say at first that the Evangelist's narrative, and the Lord's word itself, seem to run as if He had not expected, even as He had not seen it, that the silenced complainants would all *go away;* but it would be more correct to say that He did not actually expect such an influence of His word. This appears to us the simplest meaning of His *question*, which de Wette boldly terms "inappropriate." Yet this question has a solemn preliminary meaning for the woman herself—*seest thou?* Behold the effect of conscience! Then rises a further significance in the second, transitional question—Fear not the judgment of sinful men, who have, indeed, no right to *condemn* thee; but thou art amenable to another judgment—before God! To this she is constrained to reply; so that, rescued from her amazement, she utters one little word which

[1] Thus we cannot say with Sepp, that the entire section bears *no traces* of the peculiarities of St John's style!

speaks her own self-condemnation. And now first comes—and with what profound foresight to obviate all misunderstanding and perversion—the negative absolution now before His own tribunal. Mildly and graciously, with self-concealment proportioned to the majesty with which He must exhibit His dignity, He utters the word—*Neither do I condemn thee!* Might that for an instant be regarded as meaning—on the same grounds as they condemn thee not? No, for we well know His meaning: He alone is without sin, He is actually the supreme and final Judge of all whom external law either condemns or absolves, and in whose inmost hearts He sees the secret sin; but He is not come *now* to judge or condemn, His mission is to preach repentance and forgiveness Himself, and to cause it to be preached to the end of the world. Just so far as *we* also have become by His grace sinless and guiltless, we also accuse and condemn not others, but forgive—forgive, however, because we have been, and that we may be, forgiven. Moreover, this rule of the *kingdom of God*, as it is acted out in relation to the present circumstance, does not stand in any opposition to the unaffected ordinances of civil punishment:[1] it only assumes that in the real theocratic institution even temporal punishment, which is not a matter of rigid and unalterable fixedness, may sometimes be relaxed; as, for instance, David and Bathsheba were not stoned. Certainly if a delinquent, absolved and washed (1 Cor. vi. 11) by the grace of Christ, falls not into the hands of the civil ruler, he is not bound to inform against himself and deliver himself up.

Let it be well noted, in addition to this, that the Lord says no more to the woman than that now, in His own person as He has been appealed to, and as being neither her accuser nor constituted a Judge upon earth, He includes Himself among the others who condemned her not, and does not condemn her Himself. He leaves it to her *faith*, either then or subsequently awakening, to interpret this saying which had fallen from *His* lips as an assurance of the grace of God in the forgiveness of her sin: but He does not expressly and directly declare it. He

[1] If the woman had been punished according to the law, Jesus would obviously have done nothing to prevent it: this is abundantly testified in the question which had preceded.

does not say now, as on other occasions—Thy sin is *forgiven* thee! or—Go in *peace!* Certainly He says nothing which could shield her from the urgent demand of the Mosaic law, the "ἐνετείλατο τὰς τοιαύτας λιθοβολεῖσθαι" of which, though unspoken of, is yet left suspended over her head. Assuredly, those Christians of the first age who suspiciously repelled a history so gracious, so instructive, and so affectingly blending warning with consolation, were too tenacious and too indistinctly acquainted with the relation of the grace and truth of Jesus to the Jewish and every other penal code;—*one only* most weighty utterance concerning which we have in this memorable saying. Rieger says with perfect truth in his New Testament, that "the Lord deals with the sin in a style of judicial severity, which, though concealed, is more decisive than if He had uttered the harshest sentence of condemnation to death against the woman." This is most conclusively affirmed by the *last* word, the warning condition of which alone gives validity to the οὐδὲ ἐγώ σε κατακρίνω and the πορεύου—καὶ μηκέτι ἁμάρτανε!

Indeed, as Pfenninger says:—"That which inveterate sinners do, the Merciful One applies to the salvation of corrigible transgressors. Jesus has ever made the most envenomed wickedness of incorrigible sinners, occasion for the most gracious exhibition of His mercy towards sinners who are susceptible of amendment." This is true, but so also is what he goes on to say—"this history gives us a lesson of *warning* as well as of encouragement;" and we would add—for the righteous as well as for sinners. Would not this woman be more profoundly and salutarily punished by this merciful judgment of Jesus, than if she had suffered with a murmuring heart, unprepared by this gracious discipline, and resenting the severity of the punishment for a fault committed under the pressure of strong temptation—the penalty of stoning itself! We may indeed conclude by the irrefragable position—that he who effects a cessation from sin, accomplishes more than all human law and judgment can do. And *this* is the glory of the Lord's superiority to Moses, the revelation of which is an essential design of the Gospel of St John.

BRIEF CONVERSATION ENSUING—JESUS THE LIGHT OF THE WORLD; HIS VALID WITNESS TO HIMSELF.

(Ch. viii. 12–19.)

The Lord once more, on this the day after the feast, takes occasion from the circumstances which had occurred to utter His *testimony concerning Himself*, and with a *new word:* the unbelief, however, of His enemies rejects a testimony which as being His own they account invalid. He replies and defends Himself, and a colloquy ensues which goes on to ver. 19, and is the shorter predecessor of that more ample colloquy held on the same day, and which occupies from ver. 21 to the end of the chapter. The connection is plain enough to us; but Lücke, after rejecting the thread of connection with what precedes, complains of the want of it, and groundlessly insists on placing the *πάλιν οὖν* several days later. We certainly gather that the festivities were just over and yet fresh in men's minds, from the reference in the new word "light" with which the Lord bears witness to Himself, to a usage of the feast just over; even as in the case of the *water* in ch. vii. 38. This remarkable additional coincidence cannot be explained as accident, except in the spirit of wilfulness.

There was originally, on the evening of the second (not the first) day of the feast, a peculiar festive illumination observed; according to Maimonides it was repeated on each of the remaining evenings, and the pleasure which the people would take in such things renders his word very probable. In the court of the women, where the *γαζοφυλάκιον*, ver. 20, was, thus on the spot where the Lord was now speaking, there stood two colossal golden lamps, which were ascended by steps; their light, kindled after the evening sacrifice, diffused its brilliance, it was said, over the whole of Jerusalem. With childlike merriment (Jno. v. 35) they held a dance with torches around these luminaries, in which the most reverend men, even the High Priests themselves, took share; with, as we may suppose, the liberal accompaniment of shouting and singing on the part of the people. The

meaning of this symbolical rite was similar to that of the pouring out of the water, with which the account of that ceremony places it in connection. The people had indeed forgotten its significance, but its meaning was there, and that manifold; it had reference most obviously, partly to God's former mercies to Israel, and partly to His merciful designs for the future. The water poured out at the feast of Tabernacles reminded them of the rock in the wilderness, and the brilliant light reminded them of the pillar of fire which guided them: but even as the water spoke also of the fountain which should pour forth its streams at the Messiah's coming, so also did the light speak of the promised shining forth of God out of Zion. It is not improbable that there was even a more distinctive reference in the evening illumination to the promise of Zech. xiv. 7; since in the fourteenth verse of that chapter that time is specified as the feast of Tabernacles for all people.—It was not indeed into the midst of the tumultuous whirl that Jesus sounded forth His testimony—I am the true Light! (Lücke need not protest so vigorously against what no man would be likely to assert). But it is sufficiently obvious, nevertheless, that He does refer to the festival, though past; for the minds of the people were full of the ideas connected with it, long after it was over. Even if the gorgeous illumination occurred only on the second day of the feast, yet an allusion to it would fall in with the people's thoughts readily enough; the lamps were not yet removed, and in their near neighbourhood the Lord now spake.[1]

Ver. 12. If He had merely said—I am the true Light! He would have adhered closely to the allusion of the feast. But this would have been equally inappropriate as in the case of the water; and as He there pointed further to the Scriptures, so He does now, though without expressly naming them. The reference to the extinguished *light of the feast* was only the point of connection for the sublime word which He goes on to speak, and which reaches beyond into the *Messianic promises;* but *between* these two there lies a third point serving as the *transition*, which many expositors have regarded as the essential point of the pas-

[1] Teschendorff erroneously regards the lamps as being prepared for lighting, when the Lord speaks.

sage. It was, according to ver. 2, early morning and before *sunrise*, when Jesus began to teach in the temple; the woman, taken overnight, was probably brought immediately before Him, as soon as the thought had occurred to the minds of the Pharisees. Meanwhile the sun has arisen, at least it is full daylight —and why should we hesitate to think that the sun's rays gloriously lighted up the golden and marble magnificence of the temple?[1] That *τὸ φῶς τοῦ κόσμου* is the sun, the light of day (as in Heb. אוֹר is used—see the Lexicons), we find in ch. xi. 9, 10. Again, it will be seen in our quotations presently, that the Prophets speak of the light of the Messiah. Hence we may abstain from the foolish contention whether the Lord means this or that; and take, after the analogy of such figurative language with its manifold meaning, all meanings together which obviously harmonise. The first thought was—See now the glorious light of day, surpassing all illumination, more than the extinguished blaze of these festal lamps![2] But what God's sun is to the earth, that—and *more* than that am *I* to the whole sinful *world*, as the Scripture says concerning Him who was to come. Lücke bids us distinguish *φῶς τοῦ κόσμου* as corresponding to the *φῶς ἐθνῶν* of Isa. xlii. 6, xlix. 6, from the *φῶς τοῦ κόσμου τούτου* of Jno. xi. 9: but we must be allowed to suggest that the expression of the Prophet is also a similitude taken from the *sun*, as is proved in the Old Testament by Isa. lx. 1–3 (זָרַח, יִזְרַח, זַרְחֵךְ), and Mal. iii. 20 (שֶׁמֶשׁ צְדָקָה), and in the New by Lu. i. 78, 79. There we have united in one, what he would wish us to distinguish. Who can popularly preach this saying (and in such style did the Lord here speak!), and expound the full harmony of the thoughts which cluster around the idea "Light of the world," without turning his mind to the enlightening, guiding, warming, life-engendering Sun? Let it be observed, further, that in ch. ix. 4, 5, the antithesis of *day* and *night* precedes the utterance of the same expression; as in ch. xii. 35 the darkness of ensuing night is threatened to fall upon the unbelieving.

[1] Have we not here something like a probable link between the section generally thought spurious and the connection of the Gospel?

[2] Why this allusion to the extinction of the light should be "by no means harmonious," it passes our sense of harmony to say.

If the Lord's hearers, especially the opposing Pharisees who forthwith lift up their contradiction, had rightly "searched and looked" into their prophecies, they would have been able to discern in this testimony of our Lord, as far as it referred to Isa. ix. 1, 2, an answer to the question whether the Messiah should come out of *Galilee*. The Lord, who knows their ignorance, does not directly specify this; but He rather makes prominent the great fact of the calling of the *Gentiles*, which Isaiah had announced in passages better known[1]—and we cannot but involuntarily think of that former question in Jno. vii. 35.

We may reasonably, moreover, decline to enter into any further development of the whole profound meaning of the φῶς as applied to Jesus, and as corresponding to the meaning of the great expression in St John's Prologue, ch. i. 4, 5, 9. We content ourselves with pointing to the fact, that *all things* which the Evangelist has comprised in his, so to speak, philosophical prologue, approve themselves to have been actually derived only from the Lord's own testimony to Himself. We have found the "all things were made by Him" in ch. v. 19, 20; and shall find the "was in the beginning" in ch. xvii. 5, as before that and more distinctively, in ch. viii. 58. It is a false theology which would assume the ideas developed by the Apostles to have been derived from any other source than the words of Jesus as explained to their minds by the Holy Spirit (ch. xiv. 26, xvi. 14). And that is also a false exegesis of St John's Prologue, which declines to recognise in it the preliminary ἀνακεφαλαίωσις of the entire series of Christ's testimonies throughout the entire Gospel. Thus we take the "light of the world" as the Lord presently supplements it by "light of *life*"—without forgetting its connection with the festal rite, the natural image, and the prophetic word, and independently of all these—in all the depth and fulness of its speculative meaning as a *thought* expressed in the form of a figure; and the philosophical *unfolding* of which passes beyond the domain of immediate exegesis. We understand according to chap. i. 4–12 that He who has hitherto testified to Himself as the source and giver of life, can

[1] This was quite suitable to the place, ver. 20. Locus ipse gazophylacii erat medius inter subdiale, in quo erant Judæi, et subdiale, in quo erant alienigenæ. Grot.

now only mean that φῶς ἀληθινόν which proceeds from life and causes life, and is essentially one with the ζωή.[1] Indeed this word penetrates so far and extends so widely, that we must deduce from its right apprehension the consequence—that wherever in this dark world light had ever been, it was Himself and His preparatory witness and influence which caused it, before His coming in the flesh poured forth the full flood of radiance. For κόσμος in its universality of meaning stretches over all time as well as over all space. The εἰμί has already the full meaning of εἰμί in ver. 58.

That we might have in one word, so to speak, the entire dogmatic and morals of Christianity comprised, the Lord appends to the ἐγώ εἰμι the promised result and consequence of that faith in Him which approves itself in act. He is the Light, and it is for us to *follow* that Light. For a Light points the way of action and walk, as men follow a lamp carried before them—as the Israelites in the wilderness followed the pillar of fire, the guiding presence of their God. We cannot but discern a direct reference to this latter circumstance, which stood in close connection with the feast of Tabernacles, though it naturally springs in a general sense from the figure itself.[2] The reading περιπατήσῃ (Vulg. *ambulat*), which Lachmann accepts, appears at the first glance not so pertinent as the promising Future: yet we prefer the former.[3] We prefer it partly because the general and comprehensive expression perfectly corresponds with the ἐγώ εἰμι which was *not merely* meant of the now beginning futurity; and partly, because then the reference to the adulteress which Bengel and others have discerned, is finely and beautifully justified.[4] Carnal sins are preeminently works of night

[1] This is, indeed, much more than in J. v. Müller's well-meaning translation :—"I am the key to all the mystery of this world: to him who followeth Me, all is clear." Quite true, but we must not forget the *following!*

[2] And, indeed, as Lampe observes—potius per oppositionem, ostendendo præstantiam antitypi, qui non solum Israelem, sed omnes gentes *mundi* erat illustraturus.

[3] The Fut. is a correction on account of ἕξει.

[4] Alford thinks this allusion very improbable, as out of character after His previous treatment of her, and because the accusers would not be so soon present again. I do not assert the latter myself, but according to ver. 2, many people had been witnesses of the whole circumstance. As it re-

and of darkness; and such had this adultery been. How obviously and simply does it run, if the Lord were speaking immediately in view of the preceding occurrence:—he who walketh in *that* daylight of truth and of life which ever doth and ever hath proceeded from Me, doth not the works of darkness, like that one out of many which hath just come to light and been reproved. Thus "He Himself secures His dealing with the sinful woman from all perversion"—as Rieger remarks; and thus He wisely obviates any misapprehension of His "neither do I condemn thee." Yet this is but an adjunct and subordinate idea; and the "darkness" retains the fulness of meaning which its antithesis to "the light of life" imparts to it, and in which we must refer it already to the final *dying in sin*, ver. 21, as to the original source of evil *from below*, ver. 23, the dark abysmal element of all human and murderous lie from the *devil*, ver. 44. Thus the entire chapter stands in one great connection, while the contrasts between the not-apprehended *light* and the *darkness*, between the *truth* spoken in vain and the malignant *unbelief*, the offered *eternal life* and *death*, more and more sharply and nakedly come forward into prominence. Finally: he who follows the Lord walketh no more and will not walk in darkness, *because* (this is the meaning of ἀλλά) he will *have* the light of life: and that does not mean, as superficially interpreted, whereby to direct his steps as it goes before him (semper habebit suum in usum); but as Nonnus expounded it correctly—ἔχων ὁμόφοιτον ἐν αὐτῷ ζωῆς ἀπλανέος φάος ἔμπεδον. The *light* is in us, as the life is in us: He who exhibits the light before His people's steps dwells in His own, even as the Father who giveth and directeth to Him dwelleth also in Him.

If the Lord had at the very beginning thus uttered His unlegitimated I, instead of introducing Himself by the Baptist's continuous preaching of repentance and the kingdom, and then by the Sermon on the Mount, and then by all that we have seen continually following—then, indeed, men might have objected,

gards the former objection, His treatment of the woman was, as we saw, severe enough, certainly not positively absolving; and, in any case, a continued testimony against these sins incident to the feast (only one example of which has come here to light) was certainly quite in place.

even still more strenuously, to His witness to Himself. But now their objection springs from malignant unbelief alone, which, unable to deny the shining of the light which had long been around them, can only cry—Thou bearest witness of Thyself! They have thoroughly studied out the word of our Lord's own lips, ch. v. 31, to retort it upon Him on the first occasion; but they have probably only *heard*, in its true sense, the commencing words of His utterance—*I am!* It is sometimes said that their daring goes beyond the bounds of all possible justice, in that they declare the unsupported testimony to be therefore not *true;* but we see in this only the Lord's own word retorted upon Him, for He had used the expression in that former passage; and ἀληθής is equivalent to נֶאֱמָן, or confirmed, trustworthy, credible.

Ver. 14. The Lord, ever ready with the right answer, gives a reply to their perverted quotation of His isolated saying; and in such a manner as to direct their thoughts to the twofold meaning of that saying, as it must be rightly understood. The word in ch. v. had declared that as *the Father* bore witness for Him, so also He essentially bore witness *in Him* (consequently, "of Myself" in that passage was only equivalent to μόνος, as an individualised man)—and the Lord now applies it on the other side, according to which it is equally true to say:—*And I testify in the Father*, with the Father. For both, in themselves and in their testimony, are but as one, ch. xiv. 10. Hence He answers first by responding to their contradiction in an *immediate counter-assertion;* giving the *grounds* of it afterwards. These are based, first, upon the *nature of the case itself*, alone in its kind; and then upon an appended reference to an *analogy out of the law*, partly used in accommodation, partly in irony. The argument for the validity of that witness to Himself, which was the only possible witness in this case, is twofold:—the *perfect consciousness* of Him who came from God and goeth to God, in contrast with the ignorance that now confronts Him (this is the essential, internal evidence itself)—and then the convincing expression of the same in the unselfish, *pure love* to sinners, which *doth not judge* after men's manner; again in contrast with their carnal judgment. Ver. 16 gives the *conclusion* from this in such a manner, that instead of His *witness*, the right *judgment* which is

indeed ever contained in it, is substituted—I judge, speak, testify *not* ἀπ' ἐμαυτοῦ in *your* sense, that is, not μόνος. To which may then be appended, with the strictest connection, the ordinance of the law concerning the *two* witnesses.

It is already understood that, in the process of our Lord's words, the "if I bear witness" is not said *conditionally*, as Grotius wrongly understood it:—"although there were no testimonies of prophets, no testimonies of John the Baptist; even if I were the first and the only one who declared these things of Myself." For, we found in chap. v. the fundamental idea expressed, that all preparatory testimonies had been both the Father's witness, and the self-testimony of Him who had been from the beginning He who was to come into the world, the Light that enlightened men. Can then the *truth*, as opposed to error, do anything else than bear witness to itself, and offer itself to acceptance? How could it be *approved* or certified by anything independent of, and external to, itself? The unapproved and undemonstrated presumption lies rather in the petulant opposition to that truth. All argument for it is at last only the bringing into nearer application, and rendering more and more impressive, the claims which can assert themselves. Augustine's saying is well known, and quoted by almost all expositors—*Lumen* et alia demonstrat et se ipsum. Testimonium sibi perhibet lux, aperit sanos oculos et sibi ipsa testis est. The Berlenb. Bible, after saying, in like manner, that "all things have their reasons implanted in them, else could they never be approved," goes on to strengthen the thought in its own nervous way:—"If the sun or the day could speak, and should say—I am the sun! and it were replied—No, thou mayest be the night, for thou bearest witness of thyself! how would that sound? Argue it away, if thou canst!" Still more pertinent is Lange's excellent remark:—"The question was one about *His own personal consciousness*, of which only Himself *could* bear witness." But we would add that, even among sinful men, it is only self-testimony that avails for internal matters, 1 Cor. ii. 11. He who is accused, and has against him the strongest apparent evidence of others' testimony, may assert his own innocence with such truth as the judge can scarcely withstand; the witnesses of a sin hear or see only the external part of it, the internal degree of guilt can only be avowed

by personal testimony. How much more does this hold good, where impersonated Truth and Guiltlessness confronts, and exhibits Himself to, a world full of lying and guilt!—The Lord takes now His decisive οἶδα from chap. vii. 28, 29, 33, and we may recur to our remarks upon ver. 29. He who is not *convinced* by the pure and unqualified expression of the *human consciousness of Jesus concerning His Divinity* which we find everywhere, but especially in St John's Gospel, because his darkness *will* not be subjected by this light, will not yield to all other evidence and testimonies; for, they all rest upon that foundation for their validity, and by the rejection of that are perfectly neutralised. In the "whence I came and whither I go" we are not to seek a mere circumlocutio *legationis* (Grot.) or the "divine mission in its two aspects" (de Wette); but it penetrates much deeper and gives us first His coming from God in His eternal nature or personality (the mystery of the Incarnation, that He was not begotten of Joseph), and then the coming glorification of the humanity which He had assumed, after and by which the former would be demonstrated. But *ye*—thus does the Lord now explain the irony which He had employed in chap. vii. 28—know neither the one nor the other;[1] ye cannot of course know it of yourselves, nor will you believe on My—the only possible—testimony. Even ἔρχομαι, "I come," instead of "I came," in the repeated sentence, is a designed variation; for the Lord alone can essentially know the ἦλθον, while the others were only required to recognise the present manifestation in the authority of Him who sent Him.

Ver. 15. *Witnessing* leads alway to *judgment*, for the sake of which it is borne; and is in itself fundamentally a judgment, which is again only the acknowledgment of a true testimony to be confirmed in execution. There is never a μαρτυρεῖν which does not include at the same time a κρίνειν; the Lord had just declared Himself the light of the world, and thereby had imputed to the world darkness without that light. The presumptuous, deceptive witness which sinners may bear to themselves or others,

[1] For the ἢ ποῦ instead of again καὶ ποῦ seems preferable to us even on account of the variation; and especially as the ποῦ ὑπάγω to which it gives the more prominence, becomes, in ver. 21, the specific text of a new discourse.

is only *per catachresin* or preparatorily *per hypothesin* called here a testimony, for it is in reality not such at all;—and just so it is only the judging out of the truth which is in perfect accord with love, that may be termed a real judging; and this again is as such inseparable from the testimony of truth which is borne by earnest love. And so we must not regard our Lord as declaring directly and without limitation—ἐγὼ οὐ κρίνω οὐδένα: the limitation, however, is found in nothing else than the condescending, protesting comparison of His judgment with that which may be termed the judging of sinners. When "judging" is forbidden to our carnal mind, we cannot fail to perceive in the use of the word with respect to us, a severe ὀξύμωρον; as is expressed both by St Paul and St James—Σὺ τίς εἶ ὁ κρίνων, ὃς κρίνεις; (Rom. xiv. 4; Jas. iv. 12.)

Κατὰ τὴν σάρκα exhibits the norm of this pseudo-judgment; but we must understand this in that pregnant fulness of meaning which scriptural expressions often embody, but which our expositors will not recognise for the ending of strife:—it is both the objective and subjective norm, since both concur in the reality of false human judgment. Meyer's note is concise enough—"carnally, after the appearance, *and* in human passion"—which just expresses the meaning of the word. The Lord, in this retrospective discourse, means first of all the same as that which in ch. vii. 24, He termed κατ' ὄψιν, and which Euthymius explains—πρὸς μόνον τὸ φαινόμενον βλέποντες.[1] Lücke urges the article in τὴν σάρκα in favour of the *objective* norm (we cannot see, however, why it should not designate the norm generally; and, moreover, point out the strong contrast of *their* condition and of their views, comp. ch. vii. τὴν δικαίαν κρίσιν); but Baumgarten-Crusius protests against this,[2] and will admit only the subjective carnality of their prejudiced judgment. The truth is, that both coincide in the expression; and exegesis will never reach a satisfactory solution of this or anything else, while it persists in separating "after the flesh" what the Spirit of God joineth in His phraseology. The Lord assuredly intends

[1] Nonnus: εἰσορόωντες ἐμὴν βροτοειδέα μορφήν.

[2] On the strange ground, that the Lord would not be likely to attribute to Himself in St John's account, an "insignificant manifestation," externa species, σάρξ in this sense.

the κρίνειν which His enemies had dared to exercise upon *Himself* (although His words are capable of general application, and especially may have allusion to the case of the adulteress); but we cannot doubt, also, that *now* (when His own censure is becoming more and more rigorous) He means something more than merely κατ' ὄψιν (else why not have repeated that expression), and does in fact lay bare the secret wickedness of their hearts who judged. The *pride* and the *hatred* of the carnal mind are the true cause why their judging does not penetrate and take account of the internal principle of action in Him whom they judge; he who does not look into his own heart, cannot, would not, and will not look into the secret heart of others, so as to go no further in his sincere judgment than a diffident self-knowledge will allow him.

Nothing seems plainer to us,[1] than that the following clause is to be completed thus:—*Like you*, after the flesh in the sense in which ye judge (so Cyril interpolates) I judge no man. Augustine and many others have inserted a *modo* or νῦν—"I do not *yet* and *for the time being*;" but this confuses and damages the impressive meaning of His words. We saw at ch. iii. 17 (where, indeed, κρίνειν stands in a different sense from this, for κατακρίνειν, in itself legitimate), that even there such a limitation of the meaning would be inappropriate; and this οὐ κρίνω we find in ch. xii. 47 still holding good even at the last day. As there:—"It is not the design and aim of My redeeming coming, to condemn;" so here:—"It is not in My *Divine* Will, *to judge as ye do!* I do not in truth make this My end; I have no pleasure in it, nor could I in My truth and love!"[2] For the rest,

[1] Although Münchmeyer declares it impossible!

[2] There is a certain truth even in Lange's startling interpretation of the supplied οὐ κατὰ τὴν σάρκα (which agrees with Cyril, see Lücke):—The essential being of man is never despised or rejected by Me, My judgment and condemnation lies only against the sad distorted caricature which man has made of his own nature. Therefore I contemn not the entire essential man as such; but have a higher esteem of human nature.—But it is not correct to make this specific point the gist of our Lord's pregnant expression, and besides that, it may be easily exaggerated into error, as follows:—"Hence the Lord would never anticipate the essential, proper judgment, which God will consummate through the matured relations of men's sin and punishment, but wait for the Father's judicial administration, etc!" Does

we discern that the manner in which the Lord passes from witnessing to *judging*, and repudiates all judging Himself, presupposes a specific reference to something else; and we cannot avoid thinking of the sinful woman who had just been judged by sinful men, but whom the Lord had dismissed uncondemned. This case is, in the Lord's view, as notorious and much talked of, known to most of those who then heard Him. Though those who had gone out may not have crept in again to listen (not, however, impossible); yet the Lord might impute to these Jews, as a whole, what some of them had done in this specific case. "*Ye* judge"—says the Lord—"falsely and carnally concerning others, and even concerning Myself; but I, as ye have seen, judge no man in this manner,[1] yea, not even yourselves; but tell you only the truth in love, as it concerns your ignorance and what I have to teach." How glorious is this outbeaming of the light of Truth, this uncensorious, affectionate testimony of truth in the midst of this people of *Pharisees!* And what an evidence in this outbeaming of the "speaking truth in love," of the internal clearness of the Divine consciousness in the mind of this Son of man?

Ver. 16. This conclusion follows from vers. 14 and 15 *together;* for unrighteous judging κατὰ σάρκα can proceed only from lack of *humble love,*—to which point what follows immediately addresses itself,—*or* at most from want of *clear consciousness* in the truth. But this latter in the case of sinful men has ever its secret ground in the former defect; in the Lord, however, we see the two things exhibited in the perfect unity of their reciprocal influence—the love which judgeth not at all, and the truth which cannot but judge. *His*—Neither do I condemn thee! itself puts the susceptible and unhardened conscience to the deepest shame, and is the mightiest judgment against sin. In Him is fulfilled in the highest sense of the word, what the

not the Son everywhere and always judge with the Father, even now? And does He not *utter even here a preparatory and warning judgment*, in order that He may not hereafter judge and condemn? Is not *this* essentially *His* present κρίνειν πάντας—? See in this chapter, vers. 24, 26, presently afterwards.

[1] Humanly, capriciously, prematurely, proudly—with *I* like yours, independently of and without, God. So that the μόνος may be supplied from ver. 16, if rightly understood.

Apostle says of the condemning and reproving nature of light, Eph. v. 13, 14. Had the presumptuous accusers of the woman taken exception specifically to the gentle word which He had uttered? It is most amply shown, in any case, why the Lord, drawing now the conclusion of His first argument, adheres only to the once-mentioned κρίνειν, and substitutes it altogether for the μαρτυρεῖν. He thereby tells them that He well knows the spring of their contradiction; that it was the judging element in His testimony which excited their hatred and opposition. Their contradiction was provoked by His testimony to Himself as the light reproving their darkness, as the Saviour reproving their sin:—and their contradiction is against *the truth*. For even as κρίσις His μαρτυρία is self-declaratory, self-evidencingly ἀληθής. We cannot here adopt the reading ἀληθινή, however appropriate the idea which it would suggest; for the conclusion must coincide with the original assertion, ver. 14; and the word reminds us emphatically of ch. v. 30 (in connection with ver. 31), where it was said—ἡ κρίσις ἡ ἐμὴ δικαία ἐστίν. He who sendeth approveth Himself to be present with and in Him who is sent; the Father leaveth not His Son alone, in His words, His judging, and testimony, any more than afterwards in His sufferings (chap. xvi. 32): to prepared ears and prepared eyes the Father reveals Himself in every work and every word of His Son; for in His obedience, and from His revelation, the Son doeth and speaketh all things. We might at once translate, with de Wette and Stolz—"I am not alone He who judgeth;" but we prefer to leave it indefinite, for the force of the general expression extends further.

Vers. 17, 18. He who is the absolute Truth in God, may thus by His high prerogative exempt Himself from the obligation of being subject to the challenge and to the rules which bind sinful men: but if it is required of Him that He legitimate Himself by these human rules, He can do no other than accommodate Himself to them in lowly humility mingled with some measure of necessary irony. In chap. x. 34–36 we shall once more, and for the last time, find an impressive example of such an application of the subject in hand. Such reference to a lower analogy must, in proportion as it ill becomes the higher relations which condescend to it, expose the folly which would

place them in juxtaposition, and require such analogy to be drawn. It is to exhibit this folly that our Lord, thus constrained, submits Himself to the human standard: using the irony of lowly love, which is essentially different from that of wrath.

The tone and meaning of the whole are distinctively exhibited in the striking saying—in *your* law! Here the reference is possibly continued to the occurrence which had just taken place, when it was said with such proud appropriation, ver. 5—Moses commanded *us!* But that would be only a side-glance, the Lord's meaning extends to the apprehension of all the people. The remark of B.-Crusius is in the highest degree incorrect, that this expression "belongs to the point of view under which our Evangelist regarded Judaism and its foundation, as abolished and obsolete things!" We cannot think for a moment of any undervaluation of the Lord on the part of Jesus (for it is He who speaks and not the Evangelist); we know full well, that the law was to Him, even to its slightest tittle, a thing not passed away, but rather to be fulfilled by Him, even to the end of time. The specific prerogative of the two witnesses He recognises and honours in thus quoting and applying it; even as He confirms it anew for His future Church in Matt. xviii. 16. (Comp. too 2 Cor. xiii. 1; 1 Tim. v. 19.) But it is a rule necessary and valid only for *men*, on account of the distrust with which among sinful and fallible mortals every individual testimony must be received. This is the meaning of the insertion of ἀνθρώπων in the indefinite citation; and ὑμετέρῳ is to be taken *with this*. The Son of God who comes not under this necessity, being beyond the reach of that distrust with which fallible men are regarded,[1] *at first* places Himself beyond the obligation, and protests against the application to Himself of a law intended only for sinful men. *But then* He condescends to proceed in sacred irony:—But if ye will persist in measuring Me by the standard, then must *I and My Father* be the two; yea the God-man Himself may reckon as the requisite *two men!* Beza's first words were altogether correct—"Ego, inquit, qui loquor, sum geminus. In uno hoc duos habetis." But he goes on, not

[1] Thus Olshausen is quite incorrect in saying that "ἄνθρωποι is here merely equivalent to personalities."

so correctly:—"Me hominem damnatis, sed sum etiam filius Dei, atque hoc modo testor de me, et pater quoque de me testatur." For the ἐγώ, concerning which the whole discourse here treats, is assuredly not the eternal Son as such, but the Son of man come in the flesh and bearing witness to Himself, *to whom God giveth witness*, Acts ii. 22. And this witness of God confirming the truth which was already evident in itself, the Lord reckons as the lacking concurrent testimony of a second *man*. We may refer to all that was said on chap. v. concerning the testimony of the Father.

Ver. 19. There are many who think with Augustine,[1] that the petulant interjection of the Jews referred to a *human father;* and Gualther (in Lampe) dilates thus strongly upon this notion: —"They receive Him with mockery, because He would oppose a poor, common, artizan, and one who probably was no longer alive, to the most sacred and most learned college of the Pharisees and Scribes." But we cannot think, after so many discourses of our Lord concerning His Father in Heaven, that the Jews could ever have represented themselves as understanding Him of an earthly father. They knew full well, nor do they deny that they understand Him to refer to *God* as His Father; but it is this very thing which gives bitterness to their question. Klee says excellently—"that the question was not well-meaning and child-like, but scornful and malicious, is perfectly plain from the connection; just as the somewhat similar question of Philip afterwards, chap. xiv. 8, approves its simplicity of intention by a reference to the whole context." Yes, verily, although there (chap. xiv. 7), the Lord was constrained to say the same thing to His disciples which He now replies to the Jews; yet was the desire of Philip something very different from the cutting mockery which returns, after the Lord's argument was closed, to the first assertion again—Thou still bearest witness to Thyself! Still *alone* as a presumptuous and deceiving *man!* Luther rightly understood them as meaning to say—"We hear not any testimony of the Father!" Or stronger:—We know well that Thou speakest of God who should testify in Thy favour as Thy Father. But we

[1] Apollinarius also in the Catena, who would prove it from the ποῦ suiting that idea alone.

know not *the* "Father," that is not our God (see afterwards ver. 54)—where is Thy Father? Whence hast Thou to bring Him? "Swift with this testimony that we may hear it!" We cannot precisely say that they thereby "denied their Old Testament faith, the faith in the invisibility and omnipresence of God" but instead of that we may say that they deny their own ears and eyes, and will not discern the immediate manifestations of the living and true God present before them. For they cry out as blind, who say that they see (chap. ix. 41), demanding of the Light of the world then shining before them—Where is Thy shining? What reply can the Lord make to *this* contradiction, but mournfully to return into the same circle of demonstration, which lay at the foundation of the whole discourse in chap. v.?[1] There is no knowledge of God as the Father of Jesus Christ to be derived from any other voice or form than His own: He is known, as before, only through His Son. For the Father testifies *of* Him, only as He testifies *in* Him. He who rejects the Son shows on his part that he knoweth not the Father, and *will not* know Him. Thus is the reproof of chap. vii. 28, 29, enforced from Him in yet stronger terms:—see afterwards ch. viii. 37, 43, 47, 55. The *not knowing* is their heaviest condemnation; as appears once more in ch. xv. 21, xvi. 3.

The Evangelist by his emphatic *ταῦτα τὰ ῥήματα* gives his own observation of the mighty judicial influence of these condemnatory words, and presupposes, as we see, that the people were eager once more to lay hands upon Him, as in ch. vii. 30 after a like discourse.

But His hour was not yet come! The mention of *γαζοφυλάκιον*[2] is intended to indicate that Jesus thus spake openly, in a much-frequented place, as Nonnus rightly paraphrased it.[3]

[1] On the *ἄν* see note on chap. v. 46.

[2] See upon Mar. xii. 41. In the court of the women, where the treasury was, and thence bearing this name.

[3] In the well-considered addition—*ὀππόθ. πολλοὶ ποικίλα δῶρα φέροντες ἐπεστείχοντο πολῖται.*

FINAL AND CONFLICTING CONVERSATION: THE DYING IN THEIR SINS; BELIEF THAT I AM HE; TRUE FREEDOM; THE CHILDREN OF ABRAHAM AND THE CHILDREN OF THE DEVIL; CHRIST BEFORE ABRAHAM.

(Ch. viii. 21–58.)

This is the last great conversation with the Jews, in which will be exhibited the most rigorous conflict and opposition. Ever the same and yet ever connected with something new, His ἐγώ εἰμι is the sublime and peaceful answer to all contradiction. But He also condemns their sin with ever-increasing and more open severity, discloses to them its devilish source, denounces destruction upon the unbelieving, and promises to those who believe eternal life. *Without sin* as to His humanity, *from the beginning* as to His Divinity, He confronts the children of the Murderer and the Liar! There is an unbroken connection, for every rejoinder and every advantage gained by His word is immediately taken up and pursued by the Lord. He continues unweariedly His λαλεῖν περὶ αὐτῶν (ver. 26), until the stones are actually the first time taken up.—His prophetic warning in ver. 21 gives occasion to, and opens, this entire colloquy, which we may preliminarily resolve into four parts. The *first* is the gentle reply to their taunting mockery, and is an explanation of His first saying—I am come down from heaven, to redeem from perishing all who believe in Me! That saying, however, is at the same time reuttered with yet more severity (vers. 23, 24). The *second* is occasioned by their wicked urgency for the direct expression of the Messiah-name: in it He discreetly and reservedly expounds and enforces His testimony, opening with the mysterious and humbling declaration of what He has to say and to judge *concerning them*, and appealing on account of their ignorance and blindness to the future. Vers. 25–29.—The *third* great branch of the conversation embraces two subjects:—first, the promise which graciously discerns at once the beginning of faith in many—*freedom from sin* through the *truth in*

the words of Jesus (vers. 31, 32), and then the defence which was immediately rendered necessary by the *redoubled objection* urged by the outbursting Jewish pride. (Vers. 33–47 which we shall soon set forth in fuller detail.)—The *fourth* part, finally, contains the last and more express assertion of His Divine honour and dignity against the contemptuous giving back of His own words by the Jews in ver. 48. It closes with the strongest, most open assertion of His Divine Being against the most embittered animosity (vers. 57, 58).

Ver. 21. Certainly on the same day, though after a short interval, Jesus begins to continue His testimony to Himself, in the presence of the same hearers in the main (as αὐτοῖς plainly shows) who had heard it just before. Οὖν expresses a result of their not having laid hands upon Him; in consequence of this He can thus πάλιν address Himself to them.[1] The Lord now turns to the second critical topic of ver. 14, to His ὑπάγειν: He repeats the warning which had already been given, ch. vii. 33, 34, but now impressively appends the yet more severe words—Ye shall die *in your sins!* It is obvious to remark that reference should here be made to the frank silent confession which His enemies had already made, vers. 7–9, that none of them was without sin: we have already said above, that the condemnation of these sinners and servants of sin, which commences with ver. 21, and pervades the entire remainder of the chapter, appears to us to be based upon this foundation of confession laid early in the morning.

I go My way! What this means and what it involves, we have seen already, on ch. vii. 33. Lange's notion that the Lord's design is to make His approaching departure from the feast a symbol of His final departure from the people generally, accords well enough with his harmony, which makes the Lord now depart. But we think with many others that He remained in Jerusalem or its neighbourhood until the Dedication: besides which this insignificant link is otherwise altogether unnecessary; we can well enough understand how it was that He should come to speak more and more sadly and warningly concerning His

[1] Ver. 20 thus demonstrates the connection, and does not, as Klee says, indicate a breaking off of this discourse, and the commencement of one totally different.

departure, even if the obvious connection with ver. 14 were wanting. The ζητήσετέ με by no means signifies (as we have already shown on ch. vii.) any malicious snares that they would lay, but is the ground of the immediately following warning (thus *explaining* the οὐκ εὑρήσετε of ch. vii. 34)—that they would then find no Deliverer from sin and death! The dying ἐν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ is incorrectly and superficially viewed, if the ἐν is taken for propter; so also in Ezek. iii. 19, xviii. 26, xxxiii. 9, 18 (where Luther so translates) בַּעֲוֹנוֹ, בְּעַוְלוֹ, בָּהֶם are to be understood in the deeper meaning.[1] The solemn expression, well known to all who heard it, may be considered as partly referring to these and similar passages; partly, as recalling the awful and pregnant report of the chronicle upon Saul, who exhibited in his final self-destruction what was the guilt of his whole life—וַיָּמֹת שָׁאוּל בְּמַעֲלוֹ. (1 Chron. x. 13.) The Singular ἁμαρτία is significant, and is to be distinguished from the more simple Plural into which the expressions fall in ver. 24. Sin is regarded as in its deepest principle a unity, a whole, just as it is viewed in ver. 34; but this most concrete of all things must not be unguardedly reduced to a vague "in abstracto." Many from the earliest times have interpreted it as if *unbelief* were the one sin unto death, the deadly sin which plunges into destruction; but this is an anticipation of the Holy Spirit's gracious and sharp conviction (ch. xvi. 9), and is inappropriate here, where the Lord, ver. 24, opposes to unbelief the many ἁμαρτίαι which only by faith are to be removed. Bengel's keen observation is correct, that in this first saying the emphasis falls upon the *sin*, in the subsequent repetition of it, upon the *dying* in their sins. In sin will ye die away, ye will retain and carry it with you even to death and doom; that is, now for the first time—Not free and delivered from it, inasmuch as ye have rejected Me who offer you this deliverance. Ye will die in a *state of sin*, tainted with sin (Euthym. ver. 24 συνεχόμενοι), or, yet more distinctly—sunken and overwhelmed in your evil and wretchedness, which can only issue in *death*. (Nonnus has afterwards on ver. 24 poetically

[1] Zeller (Beugg. Monatsbl. 1851. Nr. 4) shows the great difference between dying in their sins and because of their sins—with an excellent illustration from the two crucified thieves. Both die because of their sin, but only one in his sins.

but sound, δυσσεβίης ἐγκύμονες.) We must be on our guard against giving this warning of Jesus too political an application to the downfall of the nation as a whole. That was indeed the great historical exhibition of what was signified; but the remark of Baumgarten-Crusius is quite correct, that in the three synoptic Evangelists the last warning discourses of Jesus refer more to the fate of the people, but that in St John the warnings are pointed to their individual persons as such. Certainly in ch. viii. the latter reference is most evidently marked.

The interruption of the Jews at this point does not in the slightest degree enter into the meaning of the solemn words, but clings to the repeated ὑπάγω, and without daring to utter itself directly to Jesus any more than at ch. vii. 35, 36. It is full of infatuated malignity, being much beyond their former question of ignorant curiosity, which might have had misunderstanding as its foundation. But this descends to the most rabid and common scorn. They are obliged to show that they understand Him to speak of an absolute departure to the other world. They are fully conscious of themselves seeking to kill Him; yet they pervert His words and ask—Is this voluntary *going away* from us intended to mean that He (in despair of escaping us) will kill Himself? It must be remembered, in connection with this, that among the Israelites, unlike the heathen, there existed a peculiar abhorrence of suicide. If the quotation usually made from Josephus (de Bell. Jud. 3, 8, 5) does not represent the popular supposition precisely, it nevertheless is so far applicable as to suggest the malignant ὅπου which their bitter thoughts referred to the ὑπάγειν of the self-murderer—*thither* we cannot come, we the devout children of Abraham shall not indeed follow Him *there!* Omitting this thought it would have been too obvious for denial that they would in death assuredly follow Him into Sheol. (1 Sam. xxviii. 19.) So that there is a ᾅδης σκοτιώτερος to which they now consign the Lord, as they had before sent Him to the Gentiles!

Ver. 23. If the Lord on that former occasion forbore to break silence with regard to their misapprehension, He will now speak out all the more plainly on account of their malice; for He will not at this feast permit His mouth to be stopped, He will not refrain His lips. (Ps. xl. 9.) But what an answer does He give,

which passing by their scorn, bears yet more strenuously and clearly its full testimony! (Hence again εἶπεν instead of ἀπεκρίθη.) What He now utters—Ye are from beneath, I am from above—is amply and at once demonstrated in His serene and peaceful words as opposed to their audacious malice.[1] Yea verily, if no faith in them form through regeneration the bridge of transition, they can never come to the place whither He goes, and where He *already is* in His true being as it regards His original: they cannot even come to the right understanding of His plainest words, words which lay hold upon their consciences, and touch them where man must ever be touched, by appeal to *sin and death!* There is a gulf fixed between, as between above and below—heaven and hell. Or may this last contrast be regarded as too violent, and inapplicable here? We can scarcely believe that it is. It is clear of itself, and is demonstrated by the succeeding statement, that τὰ κάτω and τὰ ἄνω must mean something quite different from the previous saying of ch. iii. 31. But in this succeeding sentence the Lord evidently descends and softens His expression, since He says no more of Himself than what holds good also of those who believe in Him—they are not of this world. (Ch. xv. 19, xvii. 14, 16.) If thus the two statements are *not parallel*, and if He had signified by His ἄνω *Heaven*, according to the analogy of all His other discourses concerning the place He came from, then must the antithetic κάτω necessarily, to our apprehension, refer to the extreme opposite of heaven (Matt. xi. 23). We know very well that in other places the *earth* alone is the corresponding opposite of heaven, and in similar phrase, for example Acts ii. 19; Ex. xx. 4, etc. But this does not prove that the κάτω standing *absolutely* here (which must not be overlooked) means, as Bengel thinks, only ex terrâ. And all the less as *this*, as a phrase indicating place simply, involves nothing essentially *evil*, as we may learn from the words of the Baptist, ch. iii. 31. Ye are earthly-minded (or merely *low* minded!)—is a meaning which falls far below the character of *sharp contrast* which pervades the whole chapter. If the follow-

[1] Teschendorff's interpolation is so far very good—"That which ye now say troubles Me not!" Schleiermacher—"The Lord answers their dark and confused sayings as if He had not heard them; He calmly pursues His former discourse."

ing member of the verse is to be regarded as a descent and softening of His words, then must the ἐκ τῶν κάτω of the preceding have asserted something much deeper than merely ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου τούτου. Fikenscher writes: "if the Greek phrase could be established from the New Test. I should be inclined to expound it *from hell;* the antithesis with heaven would be then more definite." But the Old Testament must be sufficient for the interpretation of the phrase, though we have even in the New, Eph. iv. 9, κατώτερα μέρη τῆς γῆς manifestly for Hades, whatever the new exegesis may say in opposition. For he who does not discern this meaning in the corresponding תַּחְתִּיּוֹת הָאָרֶץ (Ps. lxiii. 10, comp. lv. 16; Ps. cxxxix. 15; Ezek. xxvi. 20, xxxii. 18, and even Isa. xliv. 23, in spite of a false and superficial interpretation) must be altogether wanting in the power to read aright. This is our full justification for maintaining that the Lord now already points in this κάτω (as His discourses commonly prepare their own way) to that which, in ver. 44, is more plainly announced. (Nonnus: ὑμεῖς νερτερίοιο κατήλυδες ἐστὲ βερέθρου—Erasmus in his paraphrase, ab infernis.) This alone corresponds entirely with their *dying* in their sins, which cannot here refer simply to bodily death; thus in their case as in His, whither they go is conformable with whence they come. Finally, let the deep intimation be observed as it is an actual reply: *Ye* are the self-destroyers, who will cast yourselves into the abyss of despair, because ye will remain in those sins which spring from the abyss.[1]

Ver. 24. As it regards the repetitions of this chapter, and generally of all St John's reports of our Lord's discourses, which certain critics denominate "tedious," Ebrard has well said:—"the contradictions of their errors must necessarily consist in ever-recurring repetitions of principles, as their objections are

[1] These words have been even connected with ver. 6, according to the interpretation of the writing upon the ground which was mentioned above, but we may safely leave this uninvestigated. Münchmeyer opposes my view; and comparing chap. iii. 31 (which, however, is inapplicable to the case of these Jews) sees in this κάτω only "earthly," involving no blame; with an *advance* in the meaning afterwards—ye are *of the world!*—But I can only reply as above. Indeed, to say without any argument "I do not so understand it, but otherwise," is the undoubted right of every censor, but nothing is thereby corrected.

ever, with all their differences, the same in their reality." But we would add two observations to this: first, that the nail which His testimony with its repeated strokes would fasten, is fixed in their heart and conscience, not in their understanding; and then, that this very circumstance exhibits the *patience* of our Saviour's love in a manner which never can be sufficiently observed.—Moreover, there is never any pure repetition, not even here, as we have already seen; the ἀποθανεῖσθε precedes now with more strength, and the plural ἁμαρτίαις comes home more convincingly to their actual life. *If ye believe not*—this is certainly what was intended in ver. 21; but it is now first made prominent against all misunderstanding, as the condition and the limitation of the threatened death. We detect here already the self-same utterance which at the close, Mark xvi. 16, leaves only damnation to the unbelievers! The ἐγώ εἰμι, standing absolutely here and in ver. 28, is of special emphasis. Of this we may first of all, and with great propriety say that its predicate must be supplied from all the previous sayings of our Lord, which are concentrated in this one declaration—I am the Redeemer from sin, and from dying in sin.[1] (Comp. also Mark xiii. 6; Acts xiii. 25; Jno. xiii. 19.) This, after so many plain testimonies, was manifest enough. Yet it seems to us, and to many with us,[2] that there lies in the background of this most dignified, though reserved expression of our Lord's absolute self-testimony, a *disclosure* of His innermost being and nature. For it is God alone who says unconditionally concerning Himself—*I am He*—I am what I am, the great and only אֲנִי הוּא (Deut. xxxii. 39; Isa. xxxiv. 16, 17; Jer. xiv. 22; Ps. cii. 28, especially Isa. xliii. 10, 13, xlvi. 4, xlviii. 12, hence הוּא alone has become among the Arabs a name of God). The Peschito seems by its emphatic אנא דאנא to express the same, and we shall presently read in the sublime and mysterious words of ver. 25, a very apt analogon to this ἐγώ εἰμι, the הַמְדַבֵּר added to the אֲנִי הוּא out of Isa. lii. 6.

Ver. 25. It is their desire, as they impetuously and angrily press upon Him, that He should now expressly say, which He,

[1] Not absolutely here—the Messiah!

[2] Storr, for instance, über den Zweck Johannis, S. 200 ff.

however, does not—ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ Χριστός; this is confirmed by a comparison with ch. x. 24. But the demand is more violent and malicious now than it is in that chapter, where they bring it before Him in a more diffuse manner than in the keen and pointed question which they here hastily interject. The decisive answer is assuredly sought now, as it is expressly said ch. x. 25, 26, not by *faith* which is prepared to *hear* and receive it, but by unbelief, which, obtaining that answer, would use it as a vantage-ground for further opposition, contest, and accusation.[1] The answer which is introduced by εἶπεν (as in vers. 21, 24) does not therefore directly reply to them; it rather retreats and repels at first, for His calm and equable spirit cannot be induced by anything to go beyond the limits of wisdom and love. There could be in His case no such thing as a constrained or extorted revelation of Himself.

But how are we to understand the word which He so calmly opposes to their precipitance? It would require a volume itself, to do justice historically, philologically, and hermeneutically to the exposition of a passage which has been confused even from the earliest times; or to follow with our corrections in the footsteps of misconception playing around its truth. We may thus much presuppose, with consent of all, that τὴν ἀρχήν is to be understood adverbially; and ὅ, τι with diastole.[2] Consequently,

[1] Baümlein (Stud. und Krit. 1846, 2) goes too far when he supposes that the question required no answer, but that the scornful σύ preceding signified —*who art Thou then*, that Thou darest thus to speak to us!

[2] The principium and qui of the Vulg. can scarcely be explained. Augustine's application—"Hold Me for, term Me the ἀρχή," is not admissible on any grounds. Bengel, not knowing otherwise to escape the difficulty, read ὅτι as in a parenthesis, and connected the τὴν ἀρχήν with the following πολλὰ ἔχω, thus making the whole one complete, independent sentence; but scarcely any one (besides Olshausen and Brandt's Bibel.) will agree with him. He cuts the knot when he says—non facile distinctio ulla plus molestiæ peperit exegetis, quam punctum post hoc ὑμῖν; and places a comma instead. The Lord's meaning would then be:—At first (or principally) *because* I speak with you, I have much to say concerning *you*, etc. Mitium sermonis ab judicio infidelitatis vestræ, nunc magis etiam quam antea, jure *possim* facere, prius quam cetera promam: *sed* non tam tristia de vobis, quam salutaria de me constanter dico. Olshausen allows the ὅ, τι to remain in this connection—what I now say openly to you. He removes altogether the responding εἰμί, and places it as consequential in ver. 26—

εἰμί must supplement τὴν ἀρχήν as the subject, and the predicate of this εἰμί lies in the ὅ, τι καὶ λαλῶ ὑμῖν, which, however, evasively contains in some sort an answer to the τίς. But the critical and transitional meaning of the adverbial τὴν ἀρχήν is itself contested among the philologists. We agree on the whole with de Wette (see especially in the Stud. u. Krit. 1834, 4, 924), who has gained a clear insight into the whole passage, much clearer, indeed, than Bengel and many more recent expositors, and very ably refutes the false acceptations of it. Τὴν ἀρχήν, originally equivalent to ἐν ἀρχῇ or ἐξ ἀρχῆς, in the beginning,[1] passed by easy transition from the relation of time to the quality or relation of the thing concerned, just as in *überhaupt*, essentially, from the very beginning, radically. This is quite correct; but we must not make the distinction too broad, and reject the signification "first, first of all," for this very naturally adheres to it still, when relation to something else arises. The signification prorsus, omnino (Euthym. and Chrys. ὅλως) must be given up *if* it is sundered from any idea of relation to other things, and made into a mere "assuredly," and synonymous with ἀμήν, as Lücke regarded it.[2]

But now for ὅ, τι. First, we must rigorously protest against the frequent acceptation of it which interprets—omnino or imprimis *is* sum, quem me esse vobis dico; id sum, quod *loquor*, *i.e. dico* vobis. So Erasmus: Primum sum quod etiam *dico* vobis. (Yet he is more distinct in his paraphrase, which might be compatible with the truth—in primis, quod et loquor vobis.) So Glassius: quod vobis annuncio et inculco, nempe lux mundi. So also Luther in the first edition: eben das, was ich euch sage. (Even his subsequent translation—*Erstlich der*, der ich mit euch rede, does not hit the point precisely, and does not justice to the ὅ, τι, though we shall see that he explains the sense rightly.) So Grotius very much limiting it: hoc ipsum, quod me hoc ipso tempore esse dixi, *i.e.* lux mundi. So even Schleiermacher—"before all, that which I tell you." Against this interpretation—I am that which, or I am He whom, I give Myself out to

thus I am your solemn Monitor! Similarly of late Baümlein, who places the answer yet further in the sequel.

[1] Sept.: Gen. xli. 21, xliii. 18, 20; Dan. viii. 1 for בַּתְּחִלָּה.

[2] Just as Flacius had it—phrasis continens seriam asseverationem.

be,[1] even allowing that ὅ, τι would bear that sense, de Wette utters a well-founded protest, when he says that λαλεῖν (which Grotius vaguely referred to מלל) signifies *speaking* in respect to the matter or form of the discourse generally, and is never used of *saying* any individual words. To refer τὴν ἀρχήν to the following sentence (with Tholuck, and many others, especially among practical expositors)—"I am that which I have declared Myself to be from the beginning," or—"that which I have *earlier* told you," is, in spite of the apparent parallel ch. x. 25, so "violent a transposition" (as Klee says), that we are compelled to give it up.[2]

Is then the difficulty to be solved philologically, or not? Lücke has in desperation marked out a course which appears as a most unhappy way of escape from its pressure. He takes (in company, indeed, with some ancients) the whole clause as a *question*, ὅ, τι being *wherefore;* and regards Jesus as indignantly asking—"*Why do I still speak to you*, who are so little inclined to hear and understand?" And he gives the question, further, a tone which would say—"*generally*, I know not, wherefore I yet speak further to you!"[3] Apart from the suspicious turn given to the καί, we cannot but wonder that Lücke's "Christian consciousness" did not recoil from such an outbreak of *indignation* on the part of Jesus. His patient answer in chap. x. 25, which is quoted in favour of the above, is something altogether different from what would be here a reiterated passionate reply to passion. It is most unseemly to think of any such thing in connection with Him, whose undisturbed serenity here and everywhere stands out in perfect contrast with the tumultuous excitement of His foes; for then would He not have main-

[1] Hess: "*We are now where we were before.* I might have much to say concerning you," etc. Berlenb. Bib. :—It comes back to what I have already said to you. Klee: Truly, what I said to you!

[2] Nonnus: ὁ, τι περ ὑμῖν ἐξ ἀρχῆς ὀάριζον. The recent London Heb. N. T. scruples not to translate: זֶה אֲשֶׁר אֲמַרְתִּי אֲלֵיכֶם מֵרֵאשִׁית; but even then it should be בַּתְּחִלָּה or מֵרֵאשִׁית אֶת אֲשֶׁר מְדַבֵּר לָכֶם.

[3] Whether Euthymius leaned that way, is very doubtful. His words—ὅλως ὅτι καὶ λαλῶ ὑμῖν, περιττόν ἐστιν—ἀνάξιοι γάρ ἐστε παντὸς λόγου ὡς πειρασταί—may be understood otherwise, especially on account of the preceding ἐλλειπτικὸν τὸ ῥῆμα.

tained even that triumph of equanimity over His enemies which the Missionary must exhibit to the Hindoos. This would pervert the inmost meaning and spirit of His sublime reply into a petulant and abrupt ending of the controversy; quite out of harmony with the unwearied patience which renews in ver. 26 the appeal, not speaking of *them*, but still testifying of *Himself* as the Sent of the Father, thus continuing to answer their question.[1]

But it is time now to give conclusively the true meaning, as, with more or less distinctness, it has been in later times perceived. "I *am* that which I *speak!*" Is not this as simply harmonious in the phraseology, as it is internally true? True, indeed, in a most profoundly internal sense, so that the great mass of interpretations has been constrained more or less closely to graze it. Thus "the *καί* expresses the correspondency of the *εἶναι* and *λαλεῖν*," as Lücke himself says; and that with an emphasis which is the pith of the whole.[2] "The *καί* serves to establish an identity between that which Jesus speaks, and that which He is. The meaning of the words is—Ask not after *what I am*. Give ear before all things—before ye form any conception of Me, and give Me any name,—to My sayings, and understand from them with unbiassed susceptibility to the truth, Who I am!" (de Wette). We confidently ask, whether anything can be more appropriate to the connection? Dräseke:—"Only let Me be to you what I can approve Myself to be, as I now stand before you. I ask you—Wherefore understand ye not My speech?" (ver. 43). Luther himself hit the meaning in his comment, better than in the text of the translation; not so much in the words which we shall afterwards quote with v. Gerlach,

[1] Which last Baümlein in his protest against this exposition makes strongly prominent.

[2] The late v. Meyer wrote to me that he thought this *ὅ, τι καί* a Græcism, and one expression—id quod, idem quod, quodcunque. He quoted in favour of this a passage from the Pœmander of Hermes Trismegistus—*ὁ δὲ Ποιμάνδρης ἐμοί· Ἐννόησας, φησί, τὴν θέαν ταύτην, ὅτι καὶ* (read *ὅ, τι και*) *βούλεται*; Pœmander vero ad me: Intellexistine, ait, hoc spectaculum, quidnam sibi velit? Which observation is at least a memorial of the fundamental and many-sided learning with which he investigated Scripture.

as in the marginal note :—"I am your *Preacher:* if ye rightly believe *that*, ye will well know who I am, not otherwise." "I am before all things He who speaketh to you; He who now speaks, and whom ye will one day know. (Ver. 28.) Seek the name and the essential substance of My whole being only in the entire whole of My sayings: in them My being reveals itself, *and it is one with them.*"

And now the "*first of all*" or "*first*"[1] obtains for itself that true and impressive meaning which v. Gerlach thus expresses: —"First of all, that is, before any specific *name* which I might attribute to Myself in answer to your question, and which would not make *My nature* more intelligible to you, *I am* that which I also *speak* to you." He sums up the full meaning of this great word in the most profound manner :—"Seek not the knowledge of My person independently of My revelation of Myself, especially in My words.—*I am that which I speak.*—He is the collective-substance of all His sayings; in His words He reveals Himself perfectly as *the Word* who created all things. The doctrine of Christ is nothing which lies out of, or apart from, Himself; He Himself is altogether Teacher, altogether Revelation, His doctrine is Himself. Every one therefore errs, who would form to himself a notion of Christ before he has given heed to His words; *no name, no definition can supply the place of a living progressive apprehension of His word.*" This is quite in harmony with Luther :—"He will not do them the honour to say who He is. For if these perverse Jews will apprehend God, and what God is, by their own wise thoughts, if they will picture Him to themselves, and form their own notion of Him, they must not be told and cannot. No good would come of that —He will not be known by man's understanding, but only *through His word.*" But we must make this fundamentally sound by adding—*and this is His most essential name*, that He is *He who speaketh*, the *Word*, or that His I is one with His sayings; and thus in His own manner, and under the semblance

[1] Which Baumgarten-Crusius rejects, because Jesus would be *nothing beyond* what He here intimates! Similarly Lücke—because Jesus was *first of all* the Saviour, and not the admonisher of the Jews! Is it so? Was He not before all things the λόγος—was not the setting free from sin effected by His word, as He Himself presently says (vers. 31, 32)?

of declining or refusing it, He has given the plainest and most perfect answer to their σὺ τίς εἶ. Thus did His wisdom give them a mystery for their after pondering, the external and most obvious tone of which was—"hear Me only, instead of asking about Me!" while its internal and profound meaning was—"*I am the Word!*"[1]

And, indeed, the Word *from the beginning*. And may not this too lie latent as the undertone of τὴν ἀρχήν? We cannot but think so, and find in this the reason of the prominent place assigned to this remarkable expression. Τὴν ἀρχήν means in its most obvious acceptation—now, before all things, for you; but then the fundamental *reason* of that is involved and included in the same word—from the beginning of all things, literally *before* all, I am what I speak, the Revelation, the Revealer of Him who essentially is. (Cyril, among the ancients, Lampe, and even Fritzsche, refer it to the beginning of all.) We discern in it, moreover, a very significant prelude to ver. 58 of this same chapter. In the preface to this entire work we made allusion to the prophetic passage in Isa. lii. 6, which Meyer has adduced, in connection with Jno. i. 1, to illustrate our present passage: and beg now to refer our readers to what was there said. Christ is, in His primitive unoriginated *Being*, more than the *Messiah* of the Jews, yea more than the *Saviour* of sinful men: He is the מְדַבֵּר simply ἐξ ἀρχῆς, in whom alone, and that in absolute perfection, the ἐγώ εἰμι of God is uttered and revealed. Let the similarly profound passage (Ezek. xii. 25) be also collated; in which after the אֲנִי יְהוָה follows the essentially connected אֲדַבֵּר אֵת אֲשֶׁר אֲדַבֵּר, which does not *only* mean—what I say shall stand, but is the perfect parallel of אֶהְיֶה אֲשֶׁר אֶהְיֶה (Ex. iii. 14).[2] The ἐγώ εἰμι of our Lord's words (ver. 24) approached closely

[1] Flacius, who has dilated upon this passage *sub voce* principium, quotes "quidam ex recentioribus" who thus understood it—illud ipsum verbum sum, quod loquor vobiscum, quia Christus est verbum Patris, *vult in verbo cognosci*. He regrets this, however, but calls it an interpretatio multo planior quam ceteræ omnes superiores, neque ullum verbum detorquens.

[2] Which we have interpreted in another place (in our heb. Lehrgebäude, S. 269):—One only, the Great and only One, is *who* He is, *as* He is, and *because* He is: that is, all His attributes and perfections are only

this definition of God; and in perfect consistency with this we are to understand the present words:—Before all other things which may give Me designation, *I am*, essentially and originally, *that which I speak:* My whole discourse alone reveals My being, which has its outgoing in that.

We should, in conclusion, observe specifically how here the view of de Wette, shrinking from this full interpretation, is *deepened* and defended from the perversion of a superficial application. Even the Rationalists concur unanimously in saying that—we must only hear Jesus and receive His doctrine; He requires no more than this, nor assumes any other prerogative. But this doctrine of Christ, again, is nothing independent of, or apart from Himself; if He is heard in truth, it will be further found that all His λαλεῖν speaks of His εἶναι, is entirely filled and penetrated and pervaded by that. So far as this goes, the explanation—I am He, and I am that which I give Myself out to be, what I have said to you concerning Myself, is included, and *follows* necessarily from it: provided only that it be accepted in its profound internal significance. Lange says truly: "the ὅ, τι καὶ λαλῶ is *not*, as de Wette would have it, to be referred merely to the spirit of the doctrine of Jesus, but also to His *declarations* concerning His own Person." Who then would dare to exclude or efface this, except the disingenuous Rationalists, the Friends of Light—or its *enemies?*—who would efface the spots of fanaticism from the Light of the world!

Ver. 26. Scarcely has He uttered this brief and profound reply—evading their question and yet most conclusively answering it—than He proceeds, in patience and love, to add to it a further elucidation. Ye must before all things *hear what I speak;* and in this is contained also, *what I am:*—such was the new, not yet expressed, disclosure of His meaning. But this conclusive saying is very significantly combined with all that had preceded:—*And* what I speak and testify, is *first of all* and preeminently *concerning yourselves*, a reproof of your sins; for it is only for your sakes, for your salvation (ch. v. 34) that I speak

the expressions of His being, which has its ground in itself. Existence is His essence, and all the possible forms of the primitive root היה are but His one perfect name.

of Myself. The ἐγώ εἰμι is spoken, in order that ye may believe, and not die in your sins! We must undeniably think of the unexpressed antithesis περὶ ἐμοῦ in connection with the expressed περὶ ὑμῶν; but it is harsh and incorrect to understand the λαλεῖν and κρίνειν in this passage merely of His testimony concerning Himself "as if in contrast with their false notions." The discourse takes up again the thread of vers. 16 and 24. Your *sins* are *many;* I have so many things to say of your unbelief and disobedience that I must still begin again to speak of that, and must have your earnest attention while I speak of your own sins, before ye can apprehend who I am. By that, and that alone; by submitting to be judged, and to see your sins in the light of My truth, can ye come to a right knowledge of Me.[1] And we may with more propriety say conversely, that in the λαλῶ ὑμῖν, ver. 25, *this* was preeminently intended, though not alone; for the shining of His light, *reproving the darkness,* testifies convincingly of Himself, and teaches first how to understand His cry—I am the Light. The ἔχω is absolute and direct, and is not to be understood as many understand it—I *might have* much to judge concerning you—or, I have the matter, and the right, and the power, and *might* judge you if I would—so that there must be supplied—But I restrain Myself, in order to spare you. We see plainly throughout this chapter, that the Lord did not, even as we might suppose that He could not, spare them in any such manner; He did not, nor could He, withhold any of that condemnation which was due to their blindness and folly. For what effect could that have? The restraint and suppression of the full truth would be only a withholding of the wholesome discipline which is the most powerful incentive to faith. Thus the ἀλλά of the subsequent clause must have an altogether different meaning; and the clause itself is altogether opposed to the meaning which we have condemned. But, He that sent Me is *true:* how could that suit the idea—But I say not all for your condemnation, which I might have to say?[2]

[1] "Unbelief demands that everything should be calmly and clearly proved to it, without any threatening vehemence. But there is no validity in proof which does not awaken the conscience." Rieger.

[2] Such expositors give it then this turn:—but He remains true to His *merciful* promises: or—He will in His own time bring the truth to light,

Lücke is perfectly right in interjecting something of this kind: —This pleases you not, ye contradict all that I say—ye ever turn away precipitately from the words which rebuke *your* sin, to the barren question—Who art *Thou?*—but this My judgment of you is nevertheless true, as already said, ver. 16. *I cannot and may not spare you*—that is plainly involved in the words. For the Father who is true commands: as I hear from Him, I speak. His speaking is under the same law as His working, ch. v. 19. Ταῦτα λαλῶ appears to us preferable to λέγω here, as in ver. 28; although the latter might indicate the accessory notion of every individual λέγειν in this λαλεῖν περὶ αὐτῶν. Εἰς τὸν κόσμον (comp. τῷ κόσμῳ, ch. xviii. 20) is neither the same with πρὸς, nor with ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ, κατὰ τοῦ κόσμου, against the world: but we regard it with the Berlenb. Bible—*into the world*, comp. Lu. xxiv. 47, Mar. xiii. 10, εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη. "A more lively expression of diffusion than the dative." And we find in Bengel: "Concise word, *i.e.*, These things which were before unknown to the world, I have brought into the world, and speak in the world, in order that they may be dispersed by My witnesses throughout the whole world, which, though now alien from the faith, will, whether ye believe or not, believe in time to come. Your contumacy restrains Me not." This is a very appropriate enlargement of the first περὶ ὑμῶν, and involves the deep truth, that the Lord spoke His severe words in all earnestness to those who immediately heard them, in order to bring them to a wholesome acquaintance with their sinful selves; but that He at the same time spake those words over their hard hearts and heads into all posterity and into all the world. Thus does He perfectly discharge His Father's commission, speaking forth boldly and persistently the truth which He had brought from above:—assured that every word will in due time find its right hearer, and that none will be spoken in vain. It was of this parrhesia of our Lord's words that Luther thought, when he translated—*before the world.* Here we find the full solution of the question, why our Lord so profusely poured out His doctrine upon these hardened Jews, whose condemnation He fore-

etc. All this is artificial, contrary to many parallel sayings, and opposed to the connection here.

knew: we think while we read them, how brightly shine now through all the world the words which fell there upon darkened understandings; and how convincingly those judicial words which were then despised are now exercising their judicial influence upon the consciences of men.

The interposed remark of the Evangelist, ver. 27, *seems* to contradict what was said upon ver. 19; but the οὐκ ἔγνωσαν which He Himself, in amazement at such stiff-necked infatuation, testifies against them, does not assuredly mean that they had altogether failed to understand that Jesus in His πέμψας spoke of God. The τὸν πατέρα will rather say that they persistently refused to understand, they would not discern (quite in unison with the word of Jesus, ver. 19) that He testified the God who sent to be in truth *His Father*, and consequently that He Himself was the Son of God. The gloss τὸν θεόν is quite correct, if thus correctly understood, but not if the emphasis is laid upon θεός. The Evangelist interjects the mention of this, which refers less to the circumstance of the moment than to the stiff-necked blindness of these hearers generally, in order to lay the foundation for the words which follow, in which the Lord now proceeds to promise a universal τότε γνώσεσθε for the future, with regard to that ἐγώ εἰμι which He had almost in vain uttered to the world.

Vers. 28, 29. The *lifting up* here solemnly referred to, is pre-eminently the public exhibition, and universal proclamation, and glorification, of our Lord, *in order to His being known;* but it indicates at the same time specifically, as the Evangelist remarks himself (ch. xii. 32), a lifting up in death, as is incontrovertibly proved by the words—when *ye* have lifted up the Son of man! Many times afterwards did He tell them what they desired to inflict upon Him, and what they would inflict upon Him—His *death.* Here then we have the retrospective answer to ver. 22.[1] But the *crucifixion*, as it took place through the development of

[1] Even Schleiermacher understands the expression of the Cross according to the common phraseology of the people, and says: "If it had been to them an unintelligible expression, the Lord would not have employed it." Lange's supposition (iii. 627) that the Jews might have simply misunderstood the Lord as referring to His elevation to His Messianic throne, is altogether unintelligible to us in the connection of *this* chapter!

circumstances before Pilate, through the clamour for Barabbas, and so forth, was at this time a thing so improbable and incredible to the Jews, that we may accept what Pfenninger puts into the mouth of his Zephonias :—" Among us the lifting up is a current expression for crucifying. But that could have no meaning here—for it would be madness even to think of his undergoing that at the hands of our rulers. The man doth nothing, and never will, which might involve him in a shadow of accusation before the Roman tribunal."—When, then, the Lord predicts as the consequence of His being lifted up, that is, after His glorification effected through the death of the Cross, that all who now misunderstood Him will know who He is; we must make three reflections upon His words, if we would understand them aright in their fulness of meaning. First, that He includes in one word both the knowledge of Himself through voluntary repentance, and the instrumentality of judgment—the latter commencing with historical judgment—through the testimony of the Holy Ghost (ch. xvi. 8–11) and the victory of His church. Secondly, that ὅταν and τότε stretch forward into the futurity as *beginning* with His lifting up, with the same meaning as the ἀπάρτι spoken before Caiaphas (Matt. xxvi. 64). Thirdly, that according to ver. 26, the Lord addresses these Jews as the representatives of the whole κόσμος, and thus means, in the fullest sense—The world will and must first crucify Me, and then will the world know Me.

How then does the sequel correspond with this? Lampe could find no connection, and therefore very harshly proposed to supply to the καί in both cases a "porro dixit" and "iterum dixit;" as if the Evangelist quoted two unconnected utterances in addition. It is impossible to accept this, and the connection is not so very far to seek. The former καί hangs in continuation upon the ὅτι, and gives a repeated exposition of the ἐγώ εἰμι; the second indeed, commencing a new sentence, adjoins an independent announcement. The first clause we are well acquainted with already, and needs no further illustration: —excepting just to remark upon the intertwined ποιεῖν and λαλεῖν (in relation to both of which equally ἀπ' ἐμαυτοῦ is denied), as well as upon the profound condescension of the use of ἐδίδαξε. (Comp. upon ch. v. 20.) The second clause contains a very

natural conclusion; intimating the reason of that before-announced victory in death—the might and power of the Father never failing Him to the last. The ἀφῆκε refers not directly to the future, but embraces the whole extant period since His sending into the world, passing onward to the great futurity. The Aorist depends on πέμψας, as Winer remarks, but not that we should think of the "act of sending and of the οὐκ ἀφιέναι as one," nor as if He would say:—"The Father left Me not alone upon the earth, but promised Me when He sent Me His constant presence and help." But the ἀφῆκε belongs also to the continuous μετ' ἐμοῦ ἐστιν, and embraces the whole period since His mission, for the confirming ὅτι with a πάντοτε follows. (Bengel points to this latter evidence.) That which was said in ver. 16 is now repeated, and with a further consequence deduced from it:—*because* He who sent His Son dwelleth in Him, showing Him all His works and teaching Him all His words, as the Son who ever did that which was well-pleasing to Him—*therefore* is He also *with Him* in the sense of helping, can never disavow or fail Him whom He hath sent. The Aorist is here actually a convincing Preterite, according to Lynar's paraphrase—He hath *never yet* left Me, even till now, as ye see. The Lord Himself speaks in His humility almost the same word which His apostle afterwards used, Acts xxvi. 22. "Have ye yet been able to take Me? Behold, I stand before you all, and still bear My witness in the strength of God!" But it is, finally, *intimated*:—And *when* My hour cometh, when it will be permitted *to you* to lift Me up—*even then*, when He should most fearfully be left alone, His disciples forsaking Him (ch. xvi. 32), Israel rejecting Him, the world knowing Him not, the Father *would not* leave Him alone. Hence it is evident that *this* clause cannot depend upon the γνώσεσθε ὅτι; but is parallel with it as the ground of hope and promise. When the Lord thus once more, as often previously, but now in the most lowly possible expression, points to His own holy life *almost* (for the πάντοτε as spoken by Him could be true of Himself alone) ἐν ὁμοιώματι of all holy men doing the things which please God, as manifest to the eyes of all the world,—we cannot but perceive a new contrast with vers. 7, 21, 24, and a preparation for ver. 46 in this same chapter, *where the Holy One places Himself in opposition to all man's sinful race.*

The mediating transition will be plainly manifest in vers. 34, 35, 38.

Thus composed and dignified, thus keenly penetrating every interlocution of the excited masses in the midst of whom He peacefully stood, thus meekly, moreover, and confidingly, did the Lord on this occasion utter His solemn words. After St John had at first, ver. 27, observed of those who heard them that they οὐκ ἔγνωσαν, he very gladly goes on to say, that amid the fluctuations which the Lord's words excite in this vast sea of human spirits, πολλοὶ ἐπίστευσαν, and indeed already εἰς αὐτόν, for it was the actual commencement of that, though with equal propriety it is immediately exchanged for the mere αὐτῷ, in order to interpret precisely the character of this beginning. This faith arising through the *word* (ταῦτα αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος) was something more than that first mentioned in chap. ii. 23, 24, more than that of chap. vii. 31; yet as being a sudden impulse and excitement it is something less than that recorded in chap. x. 42 as the result of a comparison of His words and works, and the testimonies of John and of Christ.[1] A certain sincerity and truth lay in this undoubtedly weak beginning, though it did not hold out; otherwise the Lord would not have proceeded to found His remarks upon it. It is altogether inappropriate, and out of harmony with the profound spirit of this Gospel, to ask in what way these initial believers evidenced their πιστεύειν, or to presuppose that they expressed it in words. It must ever be remembered that our Lord was inwardly conscious of every, the slightest impression which His words produced, just as He felt

[1] The notion of Lange, which has been before referred to, supposes that they had given a Chiliastic meaning to the Lord's last words, and had understood them in the Jewish sense:—"so then we must first begin to act as if we would exalt Him, and when He sees that He can reckon upon us He will openly announce Himself!" "So that through a *misunderstanding* they had become his partizans!" We see, in chap. xii. 34, that this lifting up sounded very differently in the people's ears. And this chapter does not speak of people "who seemed to have come to faith in Him," for the Evangelist in his account of them, and the Lord in His own words to them, both regard this beginning of faith as true and earnest.

that virtue had gone out of Him on another occasion (Mar. v. 30; Lu. viii. 46); and our own analogous experience should confirm this to us, since we, His feeble servants, have some faint consciousness of the reception of our words, and can mark if they are repelled. The Evangelist either concludes very naturally from the contents of the following discourse, that it referred to these πεπιστευκότας, or by the profound attention which he gave to the progress of the colloquy, he at the time perceived this turning-point in its application.

Vers. 31, 32. The οὖν teaches us significantly how our Lord, with the most gracious and earnest solicitude to obtain hearing for His words, discerned and entered into this movement among the masses; it shows us that He directed His sayings to those who had become only *disposed to believe*, marking them out by the ὑμεῖς, although they were not so separate from the rest, as that He could regard them as a distinct company, and externally turn towards them. The gracious allurement of their faith is at the same time a test of it, for He knows well what there is in them; His words are to be interpreted by the critical *If*—ye will, indeed, not continue, ye will soon turn away again from Me, when I proceed to point out the first true step to real discipleship! There is, as Kling says, in the μένειν ἐν τῷ λόγῳ, a certain εἶναι ἐν τῷ λόγῳ presupposed; but this is so weak and indistinct that only His rich graciousness recognises it, and that same grace says enough for warning and further instruction.[1] We continue in the word, when we permit the word to continue in us, that is, to seize and penetrate us, according to its nature, yet more deeply, and find a permanent place in our souls (ver. 37, χωρεῖν); for in this case there is the constant mutual influence and co-operation between the word and faith (Heb. iv. 2), between the power of God and the will of man. Comp. ch. xv. 7, with respect to the *disciples*, where, however, ἐν ἐμοί is a

[1] Not, however, as Olshausen maintains, that the most insincere person experiencing the power of God against his will has, through the penetration of the Logos into his nature, this beginning in himself—(the devil only being entirely free from the Word of God). For this takes away the distinction between these believers and other men, and overlooks the critical point of a responsive voluntary action already presumed in the μένειν.

deeper expression than this preliminary ἐν τῷ λόγῳ. Yet there is an actual ἐν, and Seiler's translation weakens its force—if ye hold firm to My teaching! So de Wette is not strictly correct: —if ye continue in My *doctrine;* for λόγος has a more internal significance: the instrument of the truth which maketh free is the power and life of God. With another reference, rather to the acknowledgment and firm maintenance of the dogma, St John (2 Ep. ver. 9) speaks of μένειν ἐν τῇ διδαχῇ τοῦ Χριστοῦ. This διδαχή is not *here* recognised as such, but just the succeeding ἀλήθεια. The most important and critical point here is, that every single word of Christ, in the internally felt power and truth of which we continue, involves, brings with it, and draws after it, His entire word and testimony in all its completeness. We saw, when considering ch. vii. 17, that this present promise of our Lord presupposes more, and takes a step further in advance, than the promise then given. There, the sincere will to do the legal will as revealed in the preparatory revelation was the condition in order to faith in the Divine truth of the word of Jesus; this commencing faith is here presupposed, and must be again followed by a sincere *willing* and *doing* in the persevering, and deeper penetrating μένειν. We may not strictly say that this μένειν already includes practical obedience; it is rather the faith which is advancing towards that *knowledge* to which the *freedom* of the inner and outer life is first promised. The first word of the promise ἐστέ connects itself very well with the circumstances of the occasion; yet it is almost equivalent to the ἔσεσθε of ver. 36, for the ἀληθῶς which is there added involves an implied contrast, as if they scarcely were disciples as yet, indeed, were not at all. Hess:—"then shall ye deserve to be called My disciples!" For, in strict truth, the idea of μαθητής —which must be kept sacred from abuse and too precipitate assumption of its dignity—involves a persistent, increasing μανθάνειν, which leads to an essential γινώσκειν; and it is therefore much more than the fleeting impulse of a πιστεύειν which may be transitory, and which only in condescension to the germ enclosed receives the name.

The word of Christ, as the word of God, is assuredly *the truth* (ch. xvii. 17), yet this full expression makes evident the present transition from the single word embraced to the persevering

learning and acceptance of the whole of that which had been embraced by the words ἐν τῷ λόγῳ. There is therefore, and there must be, a difference, and a gradually developed contrast between λόγος and ἀλήθεια, for the whole word when *known* becomes then first the *truth* to us, in that profound and comprehensive sense in which St John and our Saviour use the expression. The truth of God *in Christ*, which sets man free from error and from sin, which redeems and brings him salvation! The fulfilment of the law and the prophets through the grace and truth which appeared in Him! ch. i. 17. And as the γνώσεσθε connects itself with the τότε γνώσεσθε of ver. 28 which it takes up and repeats (and which had then awakened their beginning faith), it is certain that ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι is included, as the crown and fulness of the truth.

In this declaration of our Lord, the two great words "truth" and "freedom," which through the lie of Satan are ever pervading the world with false excitement, and stimulating to evil the whole life of man, are brought back to their fundamental element of truth—which, indeed, remains in them as incentive to good even in their perversion. Truth for his knowledge, freedom for his action, man ever seeks with inextinguishable right: but the only truth is in the Word of God, since the manifestation of the Son, the Word of Christ; and this alone makes men ὄντως ἐλευθέρους. The Lord afterwards ascribes the making free to the *Son* Himself, while He now first imputes it to the *truth* recognised and felt in His word; but we must not therefore dogmatically deny the distinction, and say that in the former sentence He also referred to Himself the personal Truth, according to ch. xiv. 6.[1] For there does remain a distinction between the truth which is to be known as such, in opposition to all error, and the concrete position which is contained in this abstraction, that this truth personally presents itself to us in Christ, and will live in us. Nor is it to be overlooked that the knowledge of the truth proceeds in a gradational manner: as much truth as there is, so much freedom is there. All freedom which is

[1] As the old commentators (*e.g.* Chrys. Theoph. Euthym.) after their not very discriminating manner; and many of our modern systematising expositors.

based upon delusion, and moves in an element of falsehood, is unreal, yea, is no other than the most shameful servitude. This is of itself a word of inexhaustible import,—shedding its light on all sides,—which the Lord cries to the erring world: that only the truth can make men free, is the everlasting causal-connection between the two great words. Wouldst thou *first* be free, in order that thou mightest in thy independent freedom investigate and seize the truth, where truth is not to be found—then is this an *inversion* of the right way! Further, as *faith* and abiding in the word precede the *knowing*,[1] so again the knowing precedes the *being made free;* yet this psychologically necessary priority in the gradual growth so entirely involves a living mutual action and reaction between faith and understanding, life and act, that one might almost say with propriety,—Only those who are made free, or are being made free, will livingly comprehend the truth. Lampe:—"Although knowledge goes before in order, yet that precedence is so insensible that no point of time can be distinguished. Whence we understand how the Saviour, while He makes the liberation come after the knowledge, does not *subordinate* one to the other, but *co-ordinates* them as two great effects of celestial truth in the heart of man." That sin cannot be overcome by "*mere* knowledge," Julius Müller well shows. Doctrine of Sin, Vol. 1, p. 188 (Clark's For. T. Lib).

In all this we have presupposed in the Christian reader a right understanding of the meaning of ἐλευθερώσει: it remains, however, that we indicate what is the amplitude of its meaning in connection with ἀλήθεια. We must not yield to the rash and precipitate folly which is too prevalent in exposition and would everywhere level at once all difficulties, and be misled into regarding this freedom in ver. 32 as *merely* freedom from the bondage of sin, in the sense of ver. 34. *Merely* freedom from sin! it may be cried—Is not that full and absolute freedom? Assuredly, in its innermost *principle*—it is the point from which it starts and to which it aims: every imaginable freedom in truth begins with emancipation from the service of sin, and none

[1] Augustin: Non quia cognoverant, crediderunt, sed ut cognoscerent crediderunt: credimus enim ut cognoscamus, non cognoscimus ut credamus.

can be altogether free but those who are altogether sinless. Yet the *idea* of freedom (for ver. 32 is spoken with most rigorous reality of idea, and not in a vague and supposititious manner) embraces the extinction of all slavery which is the penalty of sin, and bound up with it. *First of all, even, and especially*, as the sequel teaches, freedom from the ἁμαρτάνειν of knowledge, deliverance from the bonds of all error and delusion, which may hold our souls under its influence. (Ps. lxxii. 14, מִתּוֹךְ וּמֵחָמָס, not to be translated, indeed, with Luther, but yet referring to מִרְמוֹת וְתוֹךְ, Ps. x. 7, תּוֹךְ וּמִרְמָה, Ps. lv. 12—see my Comm. on Psalms.) The Lord speaks with a tone of invitation to all the world, coming before Him with the consciousness which is, for example, expressed in Cicero's paradox—ὅτι μόνος ὁ σοφὸς ἐλεύθερος καὶ πᾶς ἄφρων δοῦλος, with which is connected the πᾶς ὁ σπουδαῖος ἐλεύθερος of Philo. He further speaks to the sincere among the Jews, who feel the πνεῦμα which they had received to be no more than a πνεῦμα δουλείας εἰς φόβον, who, without the true υἱοθεσία, sigh under the yoke of the law; freedom from this also must be contained, consequently, in this comprehensive word, which meets every feeling of bondage of every kind with appropriate promise. We therefore do not dogmatise incorrectly when we discover in this word of our Lord the germ and root of the full and expanded apostolical teaching concerning *freedom in Christ*, even including Gal. v. 1 and Jas. i. 25. For the becoming free from sin takes place in truth only as the becoming free from the *law* of sin (Rom. viii. 2)—according to Tholuck's deep and true comment, who suggests here what most others omit in the consideration of that passage. The freedom from the law, absolution from guilt, and the transformation of absolute command into an internal and free impulse of the will in thankful love, *produces* first actual freedom from sin. "He who believes the Divine ἀλήθεια, that God elects us sinners, doomed and deserving to perish, to be children in Christ, feels within him filial love arising in return, and freedom from all desire of evil."

Finally, there belongs to the yoke of the law something more; and that is, the analogous subjection to the pupillage and guidance of man, which in Israel was closely connected with God's law. This pervades the whole world and Christendom itself:

—whether it exhibit itself under the sanction of the name of God, or assume its own proper name, being the dominion of the ἄρχοντες τοῦ κόσμου, τοῦ λαοῦ, τῶν κλήρων. He who attains to freedom in truth through the word of Christ personally and immediately apprehended and appropriated, is *emancipated* from all human ordinances of dogma or discipline, from all servile homage to genius, from all predominance of human leaders of the blind (see ch. vii. 26), as well as from every political yoke borne only under constraint. And because all these voices more or less speak lyingly of freedom, the Lord opposes to them all His own strong Truth, by His τῷ λογῳ τῷ ἐμῷ. This whole saying is an impressive and important text for preaching upon festivals whether of the Reformation or the Constitution. In the year 1847, Stolle, the missionary, preached with perfect truth and seasonableness, in Berlin, that "if all the Jews were kings they would be but slaves—and if all kings made all Jews free, they would not yet be free." The Berlin Zeitung showed little acquaintance with the word of Christ, or faith in it, when it complained of "this provocative to fanaticism among the less instructed of the community!"

Ver. 33. These poor πεπιστευκότες soon come to the end of their faith; when freedom through the truth is explicitly announced to them, they pervert the precious promise into *contumely*, and turn away in their pride as those who were already free! Let this distinctively testing word, which the Lord gives here as a type and example, be applied to many who are *true believers*, and it will be found that the same result will follow. Such a consequence is only too natural. We understand the simple and plain words ἀπεκρίθησαν αὐτῷ as uttered by no other than the same men to whom Jesus had just spoken; nor have we the slightest difficulty in reconciling ourselves to this. The notion that at this point others take up the word appears to us forced and unnecessary, though we have great respect for those who maintain it.[1] It is a twofold objection against which the

[1] More anciently Heinsius and Lampe, then Tholuck and Lücke; as also Schleiermacher in the Homilies, who says that the Evangelist did not sufficiently distinguish one from the other in this miscellaneous multitude. Ebrard regards it as so obvious that there was no need for John to say that they were not πιστεύοντες who spoke now. Of the same view are Wesley,

Lord has now to defend and define the word which He had spoken: *twofold* actually, although the objectors urge both in their unity. *They* will persuade themselves that *as* Abraham's seed they have never been properly in bondage, *they* will lay the emphasis on *Abraham's seed*, from which it would necessarily follow that that seed needs not to be made free.[1] But the Lord in His reply carefully distinguishes the two things which were so closely interwoven; He begins with what was in reality the *second* objection, and rebuts that vers. 34–36, then in ver. 37 turns to the *first*. And here once more He critically and defensively distinguishes between the acknowledged, uncontested external meaning of this claim, and that other meaning, according to which the genuine children of Abraham must necessarily be also the children of God. Scarcely had He gently signified this than they break in, ver. 39, with their renewed assertion; constrained by this, and again by another such violent interjection ver. 41, He hesitates not to advance His convincing condemnation to its ultimate severity, ver. 44. But He does not close with this; He returns, vers. 45–47, to the original and milder utterance—Ye are not of God!

That which the Baptist, Matt. iii. 9, had already denounced, reappears here; for, the theocratic national pride of the Jews was all the more deeply rooted in proportion to the real preeminence which God had assigned them, but which they had lyingly perverted. For, the corruptions of the holiest things are the most hard to be healed. An endless variety of the expressions of Jewish pride may be brought forward from more ancient and more modern times, all tending to show that these children of Abraham deemed themselves the lords of the earth by the hereditary, inalienable prerogative of race, and all mere

Rieger, von Gerlach, and Richter among practical expositors. The last says, "now answered, without being questioned, the unbelieving spokesmen of the crowd of hearers." So the Berlenburger—"now come some others and put in their shrill cry." But is this latter ἀπεκρίθησαν αὐτῷ—? Should de Wette translate it—"*some* answered him?" Brandt's Bibel says rightly, on the other hand, "when Jesus says something which, being misunderstood, offended their self-love, they soon show by their contradiction that they had not the right kind of faith in Him."

[1] In Lampe's words—we are already free de jure and are so also de facto.

variations of the theme—כל ישראל בני מלכים הם. But after God had done so much to humble these kings by servitude, they being at this very time subject to the Romans; *how could they say* that they needed not to be made free? Lange seeks to remove this difficulty by an acceptation of the words never to our knowledge suggested before. They had, he thinks, clearly observed that Jesus would speak of freedom in the spiritual sense, and had, therefore, themselves also designedly passed over to this sense, in order to constrain His avowal, that even in this the matter concerning them was not spiritual slavery. We never, they would say, yielded ourselves up to any man in the *spirit of slavery!* They had ever been free from error, and even in external servitude had always been inwardly the free sons of God in the house of God; they therefore needed no deliverance into freedom through the *truth*, however much they might need redemption, through the power of the Messiah, from the Romans!—We cannot but wonder if other expositors will fall in with this view; for ourselves we cannot; since such a subtle transition to the mediately apprehended spiritual language is opposed to the notorious Jewish mind. Besides which, the Lord's solemn answer with His ἀμήν would in that case have directly met such effrontery—(we know what Thou meanest, but we are by no means the servants of delusion or of sin!) —to say nothing of the οὐδενί in their specific language. We think most certainly, in common with all other expositors, that they rather perversely passed by the word *truth*, and clave to the stumbling words *make you free*. In some *slight degree* they heard and marked that the Lord spake of something spiritual and internal, but not enough to enable them to understand the deep words concerning "knowing the truth," and to fix their thoughts upon this great word; they therefore revert in *unconscious evasion* to the external sense;[1] the Lord's ἐλευθεροῦν seems to them a discordant note, too injurious a word to express the Messianic deliverance which they had longed for, and altogether suitable to slaves. "The same men who were wont to chafe against all subjection to the heathenish yoke of the Ro-

[1] According to the uniform analogy of almost all such answers in the Gospels!

mans as a disgraceful servitude, now feel their theocratic pride aroused, because the Lord describes them as servants who must be made free." (Neander.) Thus is the natural man without any fundamental apprehension, even when under the influence of strong seeming emotion; if the salvation is brought home to him which he greatly needs, and which is freely offered, he finds it altogether needless, and repels it with foolish petulance and boasting.[1]

Lücke's opinion is more worthy of notice:—Since it was impossible that the Jews should have utterly forgotten their past and present political subjection as a people, we are driven to the supposition that they referred the Lord's words, not to the common political freedom of the nation, but to their *individual civil freedom;* and they might intelligently and honestly say that they had never served any man as *slaves.* Similarly Teschendorff (who makes some evil-disposed persons, standing by, the speakers) —"the more feelingly they resent their present political bondage, the more anxious are they to establish and make the most of their individual freedom, at least." Similarly Hess:—They had never, however, sunk into slavery—remarking further that "this was probably a soliciting hint that they would rather hear Him speak about political freedom." This view, even with this last doubtful modification (which is not, however, like Lange's), would be fair enough in itself; but the σπέρμα Ἀβραάμ with its pre-eminent emphasis too evidently embraces the *whole people* as such (with which the present individuals incorporate themselves by their ἐσμέν); and in this connection the μηδενὶ πώποτε, as an implied *necessary consequence* must assuredly go back to the very beginnings of this seed of Abraham. We hold therefore with Kling, that the denial of proper δουλεία is uttered *in relation to the entire history of the people.* It is, further, as impossible that they could have *forgotten* their bondage in Egypt, and Babylon, and so forth, even for a moment, as it is that they could have meant (as Bengel thinks)—*We,* at least, have never been in

[1] And this Jewish boast the German-Catholic Dowiat took for his text, as a word of Scripture, as an "old but ever new word" (3 Oct. 1845 at Offenbach)—called upon the Elbe and the Rhine to echo his greeting to his people—"we have never been slaves to man!!" Verily there is no martyr like Scripture!

such bondage as our fathers were subjected to. For this last notion is contradicted, as we have said, by their evident assumption that no seed of Abraham could in the nature of things ever δουλεύειν. Thus they fall into flagrant opposition to the humble and profound lamentation of their fathers in Holy Scripture, such as Ezra ix. 8, 9; Nehem. ix. 36; Lament. i. 1, v. 8;—but we must not convict them therefore of the madness of impotent lying, as Augustine does.[1] For their proud language only means to say that the temporary oppression which their people had at times endured, the slight supremacy of foreign rulers which did not affect their national character, but left them the appearance of independence in the enjoyment of their own laws and their own worship, had never reduced them to the degradation of perfect *slavery*:[2]—that they had ever been, and had ever felt themselves to be, in spite of everything, the noble and unsubjugated seed of Abraham in the sight of God! (Lange: "they no more acknowledged their subjection to Rome, than later Rome acknowledged the temporal authority which contradicted her hierarchical views." That is freedom in the *theocratical* sense, but not on that account in the *spiritual.*) It is at least doubtful whether they then thought of that prohibition of their God, so careful of their honour and dignity, which rendered it impossible that any born Israelite should become a bond-slave to his brother Israelite. But it is very certain that, blinded by their pride, they speak very inconsistently, for it was their constant expectation that the Messiah should *free* them from the Roman power; and *this* is to be explained by the spirit of contradiction into which the half-heard and obnoxious word *truth* had thrown them. A promise of *deliverance from bondage* in another connection and not made dependent upon the knowledge and persevering abiding in His word, might probably have extorted a voluntary admission of their bondage, and been received with gratitude.

Ver. 34. The Lord's calm, lucid truth gives His first answer

[1] "Is not this the people which made bricks in Egypt? How did God then for ever remind them that He had led them out of the house of bondage? Were your fathers slaves, and are not ye? How is it then that ye pay tribute to Cæsar?" etc. See in Klee.

[2] This is the truth in the former exposition.

to their confused thoughts, and this may be viewed under a threefold aspect. He speaks directly of the true *slavery* in the commission of sin; and then through a very significant but commiserating and reticent transition (embracing the ideas of *slavery* and *sonship* in their several relation to *God*), He places in opposition to that servitude the true *freedom* of the children of God—who alone are also the true children of Abraham. In ποιῶν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν the article is of strong significance; and in connection with it the ποιῶν involves more in its meaning than אוֹשֶׂה, and the whole expression is made equivalent to the Old Testament פֹּעֲלֵי־אָוֶן, ἐργαζόμενοι τὴν ἀνομίαν. (Comp. 1 John iii. 4, 8, 9.) Thus it is not he who at any time, or sometimes, yet sins; but who in obedient villanage of submission performs the deeds of *that sin* (as above ver. 21), against the lusts and the accomplishment of which the law, and his own conscience, and the personal experience that it is ruinous, still testifies—who consequently lives and walks in habitual contradiction to himself. He is verily and indeed the *servant* of sin! And in the full sense of the subsequent apostolical teaching in Rom. vi. 12, 16, 20; 2 Pet. ii. 19. Lücke was not justified in hazarding the assertion, that throughout the Old Testament the idea of slavery to sin never comes forward, near as it lies in Gen. iv. 7. For this very Gen. iv. 7 (comp. Ps. cxix. 133) is plain enough; and in the typical manner of the Old Testament we have it spoken of (to say nothing of the secret promissory meaning of Ex. xx. 2), where Ahab, as one example, is represented as having *sold* himself, in and by Jezebel, to do evil before the Lord. (1 King xxi. 20, 25, to which, as we think, Rom. vii. 14 expressly look back.) And who then, in the meaning of the prophetic Spirit are the prisoners and slaves of the strong man, Isa. xlii. 7, xlix 24, but the slaves of sin and of the devil? Oh that our theologians would purge their eyes when they come to the Old Testament; and look at it with at least as much clearness of vision as the Jews did, who developed from it their own Rabbinical doctrine, sometimes so deep and so true! In the Sohar in Exod. fol. 48 col. 192 it is said concerning the wicked, איהו תחות רשותיה כעבד תחות רביה—he is under the power of his wickedness, as the slave under his lord; and many similar passages Wetstein has accumulated upon this verse. And the heathen, too, were

deeply impressed with the slavery of sin, so that Lampe has adduced many analogous sayings out of their writings.[1] Thus the Lord utters here a declaration, in His own plain and unambiguous and impressive words, which lay unexpressed in the heart of the entire Old Testament; and one too which is responded to most incontrovertibly by the consciousness of all mankind. But we must not soften and qualify His words to mean that he who continuously practises sin, makes himself by so doing gradually and surely more and more the slave of sin. No, he *is* actually such already; as is shown by his doing that which he himself is constrained to term *sin*. "In every act of sin there is a bondage." That is, in every individual act of sin I perform *the* sin which is known to be such. And what must be the slavery of a life spent in habitual acts of sin? But here we may appropriately observe, with Olshausen, that in this an enslaved better I in men is acknowledged and appealed to; though it must not be overlooked, on the other hand, that the slavery of this inner man is declared to be original, and clinging to his humanity by nature.

The addition *τῆς ἁμαρτίας*[2] we regard as absolutely genuine and essential; it necessarily belongs to the definite explanation of our Lord's answer, in which He cannot be supposed to continue the abstract mode of speaking hitherto adopted. It may be said that ver. 25 immediately afterwards makes prominent the abstract ideas of *δοῦλος* and *υἱός*; and Baumgarten-Crusius thence main-

[1] Seneca: Vides autem, quam malam et noxiam servitutem serviturus sit, quem voluptates etc. Ostende quis non servus sit. Alius libidini servit, alius avaritiæ etc. Nulla servitus durior est, quam voluntaria. Stobæus:—*Οὐδεὶς ἐλεύθερος ἑαυτοῦ μὴ κρατῶν. Δουλεύειν πάθεσι χαλεπώτερον ἢ τυράννοις.* Plato: *Τῶν ταῖς αἰσχραῖς ἐπιθυμίαις ἐπιχειρεόντων ἐλεύθερον μηδένα νομίζε. Τῶν γὰρ τοὺς τῇ τυχῇ δούλους κεκτημένων πολὺ βαρύτερον οὗτοι δεσπόταις τοῖς καταναγκάζουσι ταῦτα δουλεύουσιν.* Cicero: Quis neget omnes improbos esse servos? Arrianus: *Βούλεσθε ζῆν ἁμαρτάνοντες; οὐ βουλόμεθα. Οὐδεὶς τοίνυν ἁμαρτάνων ἐλεύθερός ἐστι.* Epictetus: *Ἐλευθερία καὶ δουλεία, τὸ μὲν ἀρετῆς ὄνομα, τὸ δὲ κακίας.* And much else similar.

[2] Klee—"it appears to be a gloss." Baumgarten-Crusius:—"Mill, and more recently Tholuck, have regarded it as omission. But we doubt not its spuriousness." Von Gerlach will have it read—Every one who committeth sin, *is a slave*. Neander quotes and expounds it, as if the matter were quite settled, without *τῆς ἁμαρτίας*. Brückner defends the addition, on account of preponderating authority.

tains that "it would be exceedingly hard if the Lord had used the name of servant successively and immediately in relation to servants of sin, and servants in relation to God! But this apparent difficulty is not thus to be removed, for ἐλεύθεροι in ver. 36 assuredly proves that in ver. 34 δοῦλος τῆς ἁμαρτίας must be *intended*, and not here already servitude in relation to God. The whole passage would be disturbed, and would lose its popular clearness and its conscience-piercing force, if the *slavery of sin* is not regarded as expressly coming forward first. The Lord's design was to speak graciously, and with mitigated severity concerning truth and freedom; as if He might presume upon their apprehension of His meaning. But their proud folly, as He indeed expected, traverses His purpose, and constrains Him to proceed, "If ye will not otherwise understand, or have not yet understood, I must recur to My former severe and solemn words, in which are included all My speaking and judging concerning you (vers. 21, 24)—Ye commit *sin*, and he who committeth sin, is no other than the servant of that sin!"

Ver. 35. No one has yet—it seems to me—clearly apprehended the subtle and profound connection in which *these words* are interwoven with the preceding. The greater part pass over the difficulty, as if it had no existence; others speak largely about it without fundamentally removing its weight. It lies in this, that suddenly and abruptly the figure is deranged, and the absolute δοῦλος is viewed in an entirely different relation. Just before, sin was his master; but now God is represented as such, retaining and bearing with him in His house. How then can Jesus be intelligently understood in so speaking? We might supply the clue thus:—"He who is the *servant* of sin, thus being generally in a slavish spirit and condition, will moreover *in relation to God* be regarded as no more than a slave; yea, he is a false apostate, serving the Lord's enemy in the Lord's house." This is very true, but we must seek for the deep reason wherefore the Lord omits this profound and weighty intermediate thought, although it is presupposed for the right understanding of His words. His discourse, hitherto so clear, seems suddenly to pass into obscurity, through a twofold, yea, threefold, swift transition: —from the servant of sin to a *servant* in a quite different relation

(which is not even expressed as such); from this servant to the contrast of the *son;* and finally to the *rights* of servantship and sonship in the house. We think that we can perfectly understand this strange manner of speaking by a reference to the relations of those who first heard the words; and that they will be seen to have been to them perfectly intelligible. The *relation to God* was not expressed, but naturally taken for granted, in a controversy with *Israelites;* it was the essential foundation upon which they built their proud σπέρμα Ἀβραάμ; for that assuredly meant no other than—"We are the dear children of our God (Deut. xiv. 1); Israel was His first-born Son delivered from Egypt, before all the nations of the earth, and we should not be declared to be slaves who must be set free." When the Lord contradicts their assumed *freedom* by a reference to their true and fearful bondage to sin, His *gentleness* admits for the present, what in ver. 37 He even confirms by οἶδα, that they as the seed of Abraham stood in a *certain peculiar relation to God;* but He denies that this is the free relation of children, by declaring that they are the servants of the Lord, abiding as such in His house, and occupying His land. This is true of the people as a whole, according to their own words; yet are they, again, only servants of the Lord on the assumption and expectation, and under discipline to that end, that they learn to do the *will of God*, and not the works of *sin.* As a servant of sin even the Israelite cannot in the issue remain a servant of God and member of His household; and this applies to the best among them, so far as he is not yet free from this other master, God's enemy. Here is consequently shed a clear and penetrating light upon the entire Old-Testament economy of God's dealings with this seed of Abraham as a whole: either that relation of servant leads to something further, and this title of God's domestics—not essentially befitting sinners indeed, but vouchsafed to them in God's grace and forbearance—leads those to whom it is attributed to the possession of that true freedom and sonship which was its designed end;—or the inner contradiction must finally explode itself, and issue in the sinner's being cast out. All this may be easily taken for granted in our Lord's quick words. We should all find it easy enough, if we could only transpose our thoughts into the fundamental ideas of the Old

Testament; these *ideas* were very familiar to those at least who then heard our Lord, and therefore He could thus concisely and comprehensively speak to them. It would, moreover, almost appear, that the certain obscurity that pervades His saying was intended to cast down the presumptuous impetuosity, which would prematurely regard His words as *understood;* and thus to transform them into reflecting and *pondering hearers,* showing them that there were depths in the relation between servitude and freedom, as He treated these things, which they must not suppose that they could instantaneously fathom. If they had entered into His words with docility as μαθηταί, He would probably have followed them up by explanations altogether different from those which they enforced from Him by their malignity.[1]

We may assume it impossible for any one to deny that the whole clause concerning the servant and the son in the house, abstract as it may appear, must be immediately referred to the household or family of *God.* The words are uttered with this conciliating generality, thrown out, as it were, like a preparatory enigmatical proposition, in order to avoid outraging their feelings at once by a positive declaration; nevertheless they enter directly, and most impressively, into the concrete relations of those who heard them. It has been thought, because εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, לְעוֹלָם is also the terminus of the law for enduring slavery (Ex. xxi. 6; Deut. xv. 17), that οὐ μένειν is an allusion to the setting free in the seventh year (Ex. xxi. 2), and the year of Jubilee (Lev. xxv. 40; Deut. xv. 12); but *such* an allusion is most inappropriate here, for that coming out of the house was a good thing which led to freedom, but here a *casting out* is hinted at, a "dismissal to that alien master" (who will then pay his awful wages!). Lücke gave that view the preference, because οὐ μένειν in his opinion must express something lying in the

[1] The forgotten Rationalist Hezel gives here the sense, in a very fair approximation at least:—"In such most wicked posture of mind are ye slavish Jews. Now think—the *servant* has a hard *lot.* His master can cast him out, when he sees that he is no longer of use to him. Now think of *God!* In any case (I would say instead—*at best,* as ye are the servants of sin) ye are His *servants.* 'Since ye serve sin, God can no longer tolerate you in His house," etc.

idea of the δοῦλος itself; but it is plain that he has not understood the whole passage according to its *theocratic* meaning, because he adheres to a specious abstraction. On the other hand, the allusion which he thinks too far-fetched, is the *right* one:—namely, to the casting out of him who was born of the bondwoman unto bondage, of Ishmael who showed the slavish mind of enmity against the real son of the house (Gen. xxi. 10). So that in fact the typical interpretation given to that event by the Apostle Paul in Gal. iv., is here already hinted at by our Lord. We can scarcely understand how Lücke could allege against this allusion, that the example would not correspond, Ishmael being at the same time a son of Abraham! That very fact reconciles the whole, for were not these Jews also the seed of Abraham *according to the flesh?* (Lücke's error arises from his persisting to regard this transitional verse as an independent and *general* position.) To this Calvin too, and Cocceius and Lampe have found subordinate allusion; and Bengel gives its foundation very correctly when he says—*quia* de Abrahamo quæstio est.

On the other hand, we agree with Lücke, in opposition this time to Kling,[1] that the article before the *first* υἱός as before δοῦλος makes these nouns *generic*. Else, in addition to the sudden transitions already remarked upon, there would be a fourth; and that would be indeed an abrupt leap from the figurative and historically convincing contrast, before it had been fully set up and established. The Lord manifestly speaks first of all *hypothetically* of a *son* in the house of God, who should be neither a servant of sin, nor stand in a hypocritical proud relation to God, not even in the relation of a servant to the master of the house who was estranged from perfect obedience. *If there be* such an one, He will say, *he* has the family right and right of inheritance *to remain in the house for ever*, he will assuredly not be cast out![2] And this opens up to us, finally, a very re-

[1] Who is disposed with Lachmann to alter the punctuation, putting a full stop after the first αἰῶνα, and thus connecting more closely the two clauses with υἱός. The οὖν is supposed to prove the identity of the υἱός in both clauses. But son is first used generally in contrast with servant, and then the words make a transition to Him who is such alone in a pre-eminent sense.

[2] What Euthymius says of the right of inheritance in the son, not in the

markable reference, in which not only the εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα finds its reason and ground, but even the whole expression of μένειν ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ. The Lord, to whom everywhere and always the deep-meaning and prophetical sayings of the ancient Scriptures were close at hand, speaks in the words of the twenty-third Psalm; and not merely as using its accidentally coincident words, but as a citation giving its genuine, spiritualised sense, educing its inmost kernel of meaning. David in Ps. xxiii. assures himself of abiding in the house of the Lord לְאֹרֶךְ יָמִים, that is, assuredly, here equivalent to לְעוֹלָם, even after his passing through the valley of the shadow of death; and that is an Old-Testament expression of faith and hope in the *filial* mind to which the Lord might well refer, especially as this was a well-known and universally applied Psalm. But still more! Just as the Lord here sets out by assuming the possibility of their being sons of God in the theocratical house as opposed to servants in that house, in order to set forth *Himself* in the second ὁ υἱός as the One only Son, in whom this hypothesis is perfectly realised—so this citation is found to be chosen in perfect harmony with this design, since these preparatory sonships and filial hopes of the Old Covenant, never in themselves altogether freed from the servile spirit, were essentially no other than typical prophecies of Him, the true and pre-eminent Son. Consequently, He appropriates to Himself this Davidical Psalm (which remarkably follows on Ps. xxii.!) as such a prophecy. And this, finally, in its background would involve, to the Israelite who weighed the words which were thrown out for his after pondering, a similar reference to the victory over His enemies as found in Ps. cx.[1] "Put to death the Son, send Him down to the valley of the shadow of death! He feareth not, His God will spread a table for Him much more glorious than that spread for David, will anoint His head with oil, and *give Him an abiding place* in another, heavenly house, the essential house of God, for evermore." For, with the casting out of the servants the entire

slave, is very good; but when he refers the δοῦλος to Moses in contrast with Christ (as also Cyril, Chrys., Theophylact, and recently Klee) he mingles something quite inappropriate.

[1] The reader who possesses my commentary on the Psalms may consult what I have further written upon this subject there.

earthly economy will be broken up, the new and heavenly house will be established in its place, to which this One perfect Son will translate, and in which He will receive, His hidden ones.[1] What marvellous fulness of intimation and reference in the words which are usually so swiftly disposed of!

Ver. 36. The inferential οὖν, which Kling regards as proving that the υἱός must be absolutely the same in both clauses, is to be resolved, according to our view of the passage, into the intermediate thought:—"*Since*, as I continually testify—and ye were willing to believe My testimony a while since—*I alone* in fulness of truth am *the Son* of the heavenly Father, the Father of your household and your God (ver. 29)—your sole emancipation as servants of sin, and therefore servants of God doomed to be cast out, must and can proceed only from Me." The Lord here speaks assuredly of this as the *act of His prerogative* which sets free and declares absolved from bondage. "No δοῦλος can make another free, or make himself such. In order to the setting free of another it is requisite that a man should be free himself. This involves the idea of the Son—He alone can have the authority actually to emancipate the δοῦλοι." (Kling.) But when Grotius refers to the in Græciæ quibusdam civitatibus, forte et alibi usitata ἀδελφοθεσία, the right of the Son to adopt others as brothers, he presses the forensic application too far. This is then the starting-point, but it must of course be understood that the merciful declaration of freedom is also an actual setting free from sin, the evil master; else the former clause would still retain its force. Thus if the Son shall *make you sons!* In the ἔσεσθε, finally, the Lord gently but decisively returns back into a direct application to themselves; and the full answer which they deserved—Yet are ye not free! is made parallel with the previous γενήσεσθε which they had rejected. But with the ὄντως He rebukes for ever all lying outcry of being or being made free; and prepares His own way for

[1] Hengstenberg on Ps. xxiii. refers to the house not made with hands, the *church*, where the children of God's household abide for ever, after the desolation of Matt. xxiii. 38. But we make more prominent the reference to the *upper* house, for we take it to be closely connected with the צַלְמָוֶת (in which Gesenius with the LXX., Chald., and Kimchi, recognises the מָוֶת).

returning to the former objection, and establishing a distinction of ὄντως εἶναι in connection with the "seed of Abraham."

Ver. 37. Now, first, can this original protest of the Jews be rightly set aside. The Lord has never failed to admit that the Jews as such were, and had been, from the beginning, through the gracious calling and election of God, in His house; and He now repeats this admission with οἶδα, which, as here standing, signifies—"As ye hear Me say, I know it well and allow its full force. *But* with all that—what kind of people are ye? Rebellious servants, who would cast out and put to death the one true Son of the house and of your Lord!" Tholuck expresses his opinion decidedly that those who sought to kill Jesus, could not *possibly* be the same who had previously believed in Him—and very many feel constrained to regard this as full evidence of a change in the persons addressed. But we cannot see any reason why our Lord should not, in spite of that evanescent and indistinct impulse of faith which did not, however, restrain them from at once uttering their proud protest against His salutary promise, mingle them again indiscriminately in the general mass of the people whom He now addressed, and whose more or less conscious enmity He had again and again revealed to them with this strong expression of its prospective consummation.[1] And wherefore do they hate Him? Because He bears the testimony of His truth against their sin; because His word, instead of finding welcome in a believing acceptance, *can find no place to lay hold of them.* Thus negatively gentle is the Lord's word at the first, the positive and severe ὅτι follows afterwards in ver. 45.

Χωρεῖν does not, as Lücke observes against Kling, mean originally, or, indeed, ever, merely *to have place*—but always involves the idea of *movement*, extension in space, the filling it up. Hence every translation which is limited to the former notion must be rejected as inadequate:—such as the *locum habet* of Erasmus, or the frequent correction, so called, in many editions of our Bible, of "hat nicht Statt," or the London Heb. translation of New Test. לְדִבְרִי אֵין מָקוֹם בָּכֶם. The frequent inter-

[1] "Throughout the whole of St John Jesus sees His death before Him, and carries His life upon the point of every word, towards Jerusalem. The issue showed Him right." Herder.

pretation "proceed, go" (Matt. xv. 17; 2 Pet. iii. 9; Wisd. vii. 23), does not so much suggest the idea of having room, as of making room; according to Tholuck's *locum facio*, scil. *mihi*, *occupo*. The finished emphasis of the word as developed from its etymon is thus actually *press forward*, advance, προκόπτειν. We should not, however, invalidate this by applying to it the standard of ordinary human phraseology, as apprehended and established by philology alone; for we always find that the tendency of that is to lower the emphasis,—thus Elsner and Kypke regard *feliciter succedere*, *proficere* as all that is meant. (Lampe: non procedit. Lücke: Since it does not find that entrance or that progress among you, which as the word of truth it should find.) *In that case* either εἰς ὑμᾶς must have been in the text; or the ἐν ὑμῖν, if not harshly put *instead of* that,[1] must be translated with Luther—and Lücke thinks it the least doubtful translation —*among you*. On the other hand we say with Baumgarten-Crusius—"The connection of the passage points too definitely to the *inner* life of the Jews, and the hindrances which lay in that." And is not all simple enough as before understood? To make *room*, to press forward, advance, *spread around* (Schleiermacher well says, "to seize, place, and plant its roots within them")—is an expression which indicates the active influence and operation of the living word in its independent energy; thus not merely a *penetrare*, but a *capere* too. Luther felt this, and therefore translated, following the true sense, fähet (fasset) nicht,[2] grips not; only that he should have continued —*in you*. Olshausen's remark that "the previous idea of motion must be followed by the corresponding idea of rest, which latter as completing the former, must be held fast in the ἐν"—points very properly to the fact that the end of the χωρεῖν is certainly a μένειν in us; but we think that it is the influential progress of the word which is here significantly alluded to, and not as yet its abiding, consummated indwelling.[1] Klee more properly says—

[1] Grotius has curtly *vadere* and ἐν pro εἰς. Nonnus not much better—οὐ γὰρ ἐμός ποτε μῦθος ἐς ὑμετέρην φρένα δύνει.

[2] Lange yet stronger "does not force itself into you"—better than, a few lines further, "rebounds without any saving influence."

[1] Bengel has a pregnant antithesis between the passivity of man, and the activity of the word—homo *manere* debet (ver. 31), sermo *capere*.

"The word is already *within them* through hearing, but it does not penetrate deeply into them. The Lord designedly and expressly puts it conversely, not—*Ye* embrace not, hear not, understand not My words (as follows, ver. 43) but—My living word seizes you not, attains not place of influence, progresses not into your souls. Οὐκ εἶπεν· οὐ χωρεῖτε τὸν λόγον, ἀλλ' οὐ χωρεῖ ὁ ἐμὸς λόγος ἐν ὑμῖν, τὸ ὑψηλὸν αὐτοῦ τῶν δογμάτων ἐπιδεικνύμενος. Chrys. On which Klee remarks—"The blame of this not entering rests not with the doctrine, *than which there is nothing more effectually penetrative*, but with the Jews themselves." That is perfectly true, and where the word of God itself cannot press in and prosper in the soul, and accomplishes nothing, the guilt of withstanding must assuredly be great indeed. As Origen alleges—διὰ τοῦτο οὐ χωρεῖ, ὅτι ἀνεπιτήδειοι ἤτοι κατ' οὐσίαν, ἢ κατὰ γνώμην. This, however, which those who were thus rebuked must themselves have inferred, should not be translated instead of the clause itself, which as an ὀξύμωρον points to it—*Ye* are worthless for My word.[1]

Ver. 38. What preceded was the undeniable, visible *fact*—*Abraham's seed* and *the Son of God* do not feel in concert, there is between them no peace and friendship; or, still more plainly, these children of Abraham hate Christ with murderous hatred; instead of giving His words, full of grace and truth, place in their hearts, and allowing them to exert their full influence there. All this is in the secret consciousness both of Him and of them. That they seek to kill Him (even if only meaning that He was their aversion unto death, and would yet be more so, when He earnestly pressed home His words) *they* knew very well, and He also knows it; and just so, He knows that His word does not lay hold of their inner being while He speaks it, nor can they deny it, but give the plainest proof of it when they, being more penetratingly addressed, bound from it and turn against it in opposition. Then these things are undeniable, palpable *fact*, on which both parties are fundamentally agreed. And from this the Lord draws the equally undeniable conclusion, going straight to the original source of this:—"Consequently

[1] The Peschito, misunderstood by Lampe, in למלתי לא סבקין אנתון would just express that ἀνεπιτήδειοι: comp. סבק, sufficere, Matt. xxv. 9.

ye must have a *father* who is opposed to *My* Father. That father cannot possibly be Abraham, the friend of God, whose glory was to be the type of a man walking before God in faith and obedience. Your rejoicing in this your forefather is a false rejoicing, since ye are in spirit children very unlike to him."[1] We cannot say with regard to the verse generally, that the Lord here, as often elsewhere, uses the *speaking* and *doing* in the two clauses of one sentence, interchangeably; for He is literally referring to His own words, and to their acts. What the child has ever seen *with* his father, in his society, he doeth naturally and gives testimony of it in his own conduct:—this general position would come out into yet stronger significance, if the μοῦ and the ὑμῶν could be proved spurious. Assuredly, there lies in the contrast something like an ironical juxtaposition—We follow our father on either side, but assuredly not the same![2] He who cannot discern the true spirit of such an *irony*, misapprehends the fact that the sublime serenity of truth as triumphing over the contradicting lie must ever be connected with a certain irony. On the other hand, there is gentleness enough in this manner of expressing Himself, which only at first hints its meaning. The οὐδενὶ δεδουλεύκαμεν might have been responded to by the direct mention of Satan, whose lusts they do while they willingly bear his yoke; but he is merely hinted at, and that as a father instead of Abraham and God. And finally, παρὰ τῷ πατρὶ is milder than the subsequent ἐκ τοῦ πατρός.

Ver. 39. His hearers proceed to give evident proof that they will not, and that they cannot, hear; that His word makes no progress in their hearts: instead of remarking and pondering the penetrating and convincing words of Christ, they hold fast *their own* wilful declaration at the first—Our father is Abraham! We do not think, with Lange, that they are here entering keenly into disputation; but rather that they reutter their

[1] Tract. Kidduschin in Deut. xiv. 1, 2 says—As long as ye act as children, children ye are; and no longer.

[2] The ἠκούσατε which Lachmann and Tischendorff substitute in the latter clause, would almost destroy the point of this analogy; and we cannot otherwise accept it. It appears to have arisen from the idea that the seeing in connection with Satan's works required qualification.

former words in mere obstinacy, and without any direct reference to what Jesus had said, further than the word πατήρ which they lay hold of. This one expression they throw back upon Him, as proudly as ignorantly:—What dost Thou mean by Thy two fathers? Let Thy words leave us alone in possession of our true father, as the seed of Abraham![1]—But the Lord does not leave them alone; He pushes His words, in unweariable and imperturbable earnestness, yet further. The ὑμεῖς ποιεῖτε of the former verse He now dilates upon, vers. 39–41, and proves them to exhibit evidences of a very different disposition and derivation from that of Abraham. When, hereupon, the Jews leave their Abrahamic parentage, and lay claim directly to that *of God*, the Lord is constrained in the severest terms to convict them of being the *children of the devil*, vers. 41–47, and by a two-fold series of inferences which we shall more carefully examine in due time.

We are not inclined to enter at large upon the question of the various readings here—the substitution of ἐστε for ἦτε, the omission of ἂν, and the preference of ποιεῖτε; the hypothetical form in the received text is the only correct one, since the νῦν δὲ which follows is manifestly the minor from which follows the conclusion in ver. 41.[2] On the other hand, we join Olshausen and Kling (and earlier Origen) in maintaining that the τέκνα is here to be distinguished from σπέρμα; the latter was indeed conceded as true after the flesh in ver. 37, but τέκνα (genuine children like their father) is denied in ver. 39. Rom. ix. 7 is an illustrative parallel of this distinction in the phraseology, which, though it is not directly founded upon the lexical origin of the words, harmonizes well with the true distinction of the synonymes. Mark how the Lord, who elsewhere bases everything, like His Apostle Paul, upon *faith*, here also lays stress, like James, upon the evidence of *works!* He Himself recognises and distinguishes the *works of Abraham!*

Vers. 40, 41. The opposition of their spirit and acts to the

[1] "Be it so, the children are like their fathers: our father is Abraham, if the distinction is thus made,—*judge Thou, who Thy father must be!*" Similarly Baumgarten-Crusius—"They care not to know who may be *His* Father; only *their* father is Abraham."

[2] Ποιεῖτε as Imper. would altogether disturb the sense.

faith and works of Abraham, exhibits itself in a threefold progression. They would kill *a man*;—more than that, one who has told them the truth (understand—just on that account!);—finally, the truth as derived and transmitted from God. Both the fact and the reason of the Lord's representing Himself meekly to be a man, in the presence of such as are now incapable of receiving the declaration of His Divinity,[1] are perfectly clear; as also that His words point to the fearful truth which is undisguisedly announced in ver. 44, of the Satanic and Cainite enmity in man against God, the unity and progressive consequences of the spirit of lying and the spirit of murder.[2] We must not, in the following clause, weaken *τοῦτο* into *tale quid*, nor make *οὐκ ἐποίησεν*—"that would he not have done in similar case!" But the *τοῦτο* impressively combines the whole accusation in one, and the *οὐκ ἐποίησεν* is said ironically and *per μείωσιν*:—"the holy patriarch, whose piety ye rightly glory in, acted in his faith and love towards God and man, in a manner very different from this." The rigid conclusion should now formally run—"consequently ye are *not* the children of Abraham." But it goes still further than that, even to the *other* "father" of ver. 38. Twice is this father left unmentioned, for the suggestion of their own minds.

And they might very well understand this manner of speaking. The prophets had been accustomed to point the apostate seed of Abraham to an origin consistent with their spirit and mind, *e.g.* Ezek. xvi. 3. They were very well acquainted, too, with the father and author of all evil, the great enemy of God and man. They appear actually now to mark whither our Lord is aiming; but they designedly retreat before His meaning even while they seem to press more closely upon Him in contradiction. Their entering, so to speak, upon another subject of argument is indicated by the Evangelist's *οὖν*. Thus enforced, they let go the paternity of Abraham; for, at least abstractly,

[1] Nonnus has in his way interjected—*οὔτε γὰρ ὔμμι δοκῶ θεὸς ἔμμεναι.*

[2] Schleiermacher: "This is a profound mystery in human nature, that incapacity for the truth and opposition to it invariably glide into enmity against those who bring the truth." Yes, verily, a mystery going beyond human nature!

the proof is too clear that unresembling children have no right to value themselves upon their progenitor; but, instead of that, they insist now upon being the children of God! Thus they understand[1] the Lord to be speaking of *spiritual* paternity; consequently their words now concur with His meaning, and *consequently* πορνεία is not to be understood otherwise than spiritually. This expression should not refer our thoughts to Ishmael, for Abraham's connection with Hagar was not fornication; but rather to the hated *Samaritans* (see afterwards ver. 48), that spurious, bastard race—as Klee suggests, following Theodor. Mopsu., and Theophylact. For they mean bastards as resulting from the adulterous connection of the Jewish people with *false gods;* retaining a distinct remembrance of those ancient passages in which this was denounced against their fathers as a crime. Ex. xxxiv. 16; Lev. xvii. 7; Judg. ii. 17; Hos. i. 2, ii. 4; Isa. i. 21, lvii. 3; Jer. iii. 8; Ezek. xvi. 15, etc. To these false gods they oppose the *One true God*, from whom it is their Pharisaic pride to assert that they had never departed since the captivity; and this seems the simplest meaning of ἕνα πατέρα. "Not, one father with Thee; but we all have one father." So explains Baumgarten-Crusius; but we doubt whether the Scripture-intelligence of these speakers would go so far as to refer to Isa. lxiii. 16. Lange views it otherwise; referring the former clause still to Abraham, and regarding the second as introducing the additional relation to God, asserting that—We and Thyself have (despite Thy words) one and the same Father, God![2] But this is not so plain as the obvious reference of πορνεία to idolatry; and we may illustrate it by the words of Philo, quoted by Lücke: πολύθεος δὲ ὁ ἐκ πόρνης, τυφλώττων

[1] "They had understood before; but now would no longer appear to decline the argument, and evade the spiritual application." (Klee.) In the sense of disputation, of course; the thing itself they certainly evade.

[2] The former would be—"We are not supposititious children imposed upon Abraham." But still they feel that the lash is not removed—they feel themselves to be at a disadvantage merely as Abraham's sons as opposed to the Son *of God*—especially as they are conscious that He justly charges them with departure from Abraham's mind. They leave therefore, in their confusion, *their own* position of hereditary prerogative, in order to arrogate *His* loftier position to themselves. "As they could not finally deny that He was like themselves a son of Abraham, so they thought that He would

περὶ τὸν ἀληθῆ πατέρα, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο πολλοὺς ἀνθ' ἑνὸς γονεῖς αἰνιττόμενος.—Suffice, that they are urged by the spirit of contradiction to arrogate to themselves the prerogative of freeborn children, exhibited now first in its truth by Jesus; and to call *their God* (as the usual phrase runs in the Old Testament, see ver. 54) with all their sins *their* Father. Comp. Mal. ii. 10 with Mal. i. 6.

And now the Lord is constrained by their boldness to refer openly to that father whom He had twice hinted at without express mention. He does this in the closest connection down to ver. 47 by two series of arguments. The former proceeds as before; God's children must *love* God's Son (ver. 42)—but ye, on the other hand, do not even know or recognise *My speech* (ver. 43)—consequently ye are the children of the devil! But this *conclusion* itself is in ver. 44 shown in a threefold form. Ye do the lusts of your father—for he is the original murderer, and a liar utterly without truth from the beginning—*every such liar, therefore, hath him for a father!* (which must be preliminarily noted for the interpretation of πατὴρ αὐτοῦ). The second argument goes backwards in its order:—ye believe not the truth (which position, laid down in ver. 45, is convincingly established in ver. 46)—but he that is of God, heareth God's words—consequently *ye are not of God* (Quod erat demonstrandum; at the same time a qualified and gentle return to ver. 38).

Vers. 42, 43. Once more the same deductio ad absurdum, differently applied. Previously it was—Ye hate and seek to kill Me; now it is—As the children *of God*, ye would for ye must *love Me*, the Son before all others, the express image of your Father! Ye would be constrained to come to Me with the most joyful acceptance of My claims, as having come from the Father and come unto you! This is the abiding and decisive protest against the Rationalism which honours the All-father and sets Jesus aside; against all who imagine that they believe in God and think to be His children, while their cold, loveless, or unfriendly relation to Christ makes it plain that their faith in God

not be able to deny to them that they were, equally with Himself, children of the one Father, God." Acute enough, but I fear too subtile for this text.

and their filial presumption are based upon a wrong foundation. Before it was—My word seizes you not, does not lay hold upon and influence your spirits; now it is stronger and in perfect contrast with love—Ye know not, ye receive not, ye understand not and will not bear even My speech! Λαλιά is here more decisively distinguished from λόγος than in ch. iv. 41, 42. The λαλούμενος λόγος as such, the λαλεῖν of which, in its perfect consonance with the matters spoken of, perfectly intelligible to the mind which is in harmony with those matters, was not understood by them, has reference to the *tone* and *manner* of His speaking, His essential style of expression; λαλιά is therefore here almost equivalent to idioma, dialectus, as in Matt. xxvi. 73, comp. Cant. iv. 3. Sept. for מִדַּבֵּר. Ye understand not "the mother-tongue of God's children"—although ye should be accustomed to it in the whole Old Testament, and would have been perfectly familiar with it, if ye had been in the true and proper sense of the Old Testament the genuine children of God and of Abraham. Every God-fearing man, when the Spirit of God begins to speak, hears Him speak in *his own* tongue:[1]—this preparation of spirit is the fundamental condition for hearing and understanding aright; and where it is wanting, all the highest words are spoken to the wind or into deaf ears. *Love understands*, even desire perceives and anticipates the meaning. And if we would understand our true position, we must not scruple to apply this *highest hermeneutical canon* in the confusion of the church of the learned and unlearned. "He who *wills* not to understand the thing, will find the words in which it is clothed unintelligible." (Fikenscher.) Whatever perfectly harmonizes with our fundamental views and opinions is at once understood in its expression and tone. "Whoever takes objection to the expressions and utterances of Jesus, is not at one with the mind and the heart of Jesus." (Braune.) Moreover, it is to be understood that this λαλιά which those born in God's house will recognise, is not to be applied merely to the external

[1] And this is the inmost meaning of the Pentecost miracle; the mockers understand not the language, but, being themselves the drunken, hear only a confused babbling. See Isa. xxviii. 9–14, a passage which is to be thoughtfully pondered and compared.

use of language (and this is the truth of Lange's protest against this view); but is to be viewed *spiritually* as referring to those fundamental ideas, those essential truths, those eternal promises, which are spoken by God to the mind and heart of a man, and the tones of which he at once catches and comprehends. The two foci of the speech of Christ, protested against by the false Jews as Galilæan or Samaritan, and now by false Christians as *Jewish*—in which revolves the purest and most consistent consummation of all speech which had ever been current and intelligible in the true house of God, as heard in the Saviour's voice, are—*sin* and *grace*. He who understands in his heart these two words, which no human Lexicon (though ten times better than Schleusner's) can make perfectly plain, will not be at a loss in any of the idioms of Christianity, will not be baffled even by the hard saying of "the eating and drinking of the flesh and blood." But the *οὐ γινώσκειν τὴν λαλιάν αὐτοῦ*, which is too evident in many expositors, makes it clear that in that essential point they are not sound.[1] The following clause with *ὅτι* is by no means to be carried over to ver. 44 (as Hezel does, to avoid a presumed tautology); nor must it be included (with de Wette) in the question—Wherefore understand ye not My speech, (so) that ye cannot receive My words? But the Lord answers the *why*, which so keenly penetrates their consciences, in their stead (as again in ver. 46):—I will tell you, I must reveal it to you, because ye *cannot* in your fundamentally evil mind and will.

This *οὐ δύνασθε* forms the final transition to the final charge, by laying the foundation of that fearful conclusion that they are of the devil, of him who never stood in the truth, who never admits the word of God into his being. Though *λόγος* is more than *λαλιά*, yet on the other hand *ἀκούειν* is less than *γινώσκειν*; and the point of the sentence lies in this *πλοκή*, this change of the expression. Those who ought at once to have recognised His speech as the tone and idiom of the house, and to have been

[1] Now, after that Christ has appeared, we may, by the Old Testament rightly understood, and by Heathenism placed in the right relation to it, construe a priori the language of the last and perfect Revealer of God's will to man; and thus, as it were, theanthropologically reconstruct the vocabulary and style of Christ. A good problem for an Apologist.

taught its meaning by the instinct of love,—*hear not, understand not* that which is plainly spoken in that speech![1]

Ver. 44. And now is plainly uttered the final word of thunder, penetrating their hearts, whether it find hearing or not, with its flash of conviction, disclosing the secret principles of their sin. "Your unlikeness to Abraham shows that ye are not his true children; your want of susceptibility to the word of the Son of God, whom you fight against, shows that ye cannot possibly be the children of the same God; your likeness to him who was a liar and a murderer from the beginning, the spirit of contradiction and hatred, the false antigod—demonstrates your actual origination from *him!* This is the other father whom I meant!" Τοῦ πατρός is without doubt the true reading, and the omission of the article is to be explained by the ambiguity of the idea of a father of Satan. Διάβολος must have the article, and τοῦ πατρὸς in connection with it seems to say—The devil is *the* father for you, your father, of whom I have already twice spoken.

One of the most important verses in the New Testament, says Braune, containing an utterance of the highest moment, is this saying of Jesus concerning the Devil, one which goes back to the first prelusive intimations of the speech of God in the beginning of His Book, and which all should understand and will understand, in proportion as they rightly understand the first chapters of Moses. We might expect of an age which has become so rational, that it would be rational enough no longer to apply the idea of *accommodation* to this dogmatic discourse of our Lord concerning the personal character and works of Satan —a testimony so unforced, and yet so overwhelming in its condemnation of the representatives of the people of God. Further, we might be justified in imputing to the age conscience enough to abstain from declaring that in this testimony concerning the *Liar*, the True Witness has Himself been deceived, or involved in theories untrue.[2] But the otherwise acute Baum-

[1] Assuredly we must regard hearing as preceding knowledge; but it is overstrained to translate with the Berlen. Bible—Ye can or ye will not even give heed to Me, will not let Me finish My words.

[2] And we might suppose that a genuine *Philosophy*, which has its base in conscience as the surest consciousness, would have conscientiousness and

garten-Crusius is blind enough to say—"In this application especially (vers. 45–47), it is clear that the figure of Satan is used only as a *figure*—the conclusion, ver. 47, almost avoids and leaves out the frightful figure!!" This is as vapid as Hezel's words long since—"The spirit to whom *ye* ascribe all evil, inspires you with all that ye speak and teach! Christ speaks *the language of Jewish theology*"—which is an apt illustration of ver. 43.[1]

Not ποιεῖτε now, as in ver. 38, but θέλετε ποιεῖν. Even Winer has no hesitation in saying that this is emphatically—Ye will, ye are determined to do. This points indeed to the fearful purpose mentioned in ver. 40 (hence the following ἀνθρωποκτόνος); but the generalised tone given to the sentence, and which is the ground tone of the whole verse, says with deep significance—That which ye do as the slaves of sin, and from the paternity of the Devil, is not the less on that account inexcusable and *voluntary*, as the accordance of your will with that which has become and still becomes, devilish. Thus it is not, as we too frequently hear—the *poor*, and *wicked* children of Satan! That is the "servitus voluntaria" of Seneca, of which Augustin writes: Anima *miro quodam modo* sub hac voluntaria quadam ac male libera necessitate *ancilla* tenetur et *libera*. Ancilla propter necessitatem, libera propter voluntatem: et quod magis mirum magisque miserum est, ideo rea quod libera, eoque ancilla quo rea; ac per hoc eo ancilla quo libera.[2] That is the psychological *mystery*, and at the same time the manifest *fact* of

reasonableness enough to acknowledge what Martensen quotes from Daub:—"How oft both in life and divinity the observation is turned away from the Devil as a person, and he is explained away as a phantasm. Yet does the sincere inquirer ever come back to the truth, and find himself constrained to make his personal existence a fixed object."

[1] In an excellent though forgotten book, Historia Diaboli by J. G. Mayer of Würtemberg, we find the same argument:—dicta Christi, qui in capitali illo loco et primario, in gravissima sua objurgatione—coram ipsis declarat: ὑμεῖς κ. τ. λ. Fac, hæc locutum esse Christum, nec tamen esse diabolum, personam—sed fictum, commentitium, imaginarium, *quæ, qualis, quanta objurgationis inanitas!* Fac, ad pravas Judæorum ἐννοίας se adcommodasse Christum—quæ agendi, dicendi, objurgandi ratio erit illius, qui se ipse ἀλήθειαν profitetur!

[2] And such self-chosen slavery to Satan these liars have previously termed their *freedom!*

that evil, the opposing character of which ever goes onward in the children as in their father. And the remark of Origen applies to this θέλειν—that the internal will of itself without its external accomplishment, is sufficient to constitute children of the devil; for they also will what he wills, accomplish his lusts. The ἐπιθυμίαι correspond to the θέλειν; and even in the Devil they are specified as the internal principle *preceding* his works and words, his murder and his lies. But the plural shows the endless unrest, the measureless and boundless impulses of this central principle of iniquity.

And now as to the ἀνθρωποκτόνος, by which this fearful ἐκεῖνος is at once characterised! There have ever been two interpretations; one of which now predominates, though the other is not without its defenders. Origen, Chrys., Aug., Theophyl., understand the seduction of the *first man* into sin, which plunged him into bodily and spiritual death; with them agree Luther, Calvin, Tholuck, Olshausen (to mention only leading names), with Paulus, Kuinoel, Meyer, Frommann. On the other hand, Cyril referred the expression to the first historical murder of man in its common sense, to Cain's wicked act under the inspiration and in the spirit of the devil. And then strangely enough Cain himself (like Judas) is the διάβολος here; and is opposed to Abraham as the spiritual *father* of the Jews. With this agrees his reading at the end of the verse—καθὼς καὶ ὁ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ; thus—ye Jews derive your origin from Cain, as he was the first son of the devil![1] In this form no one could accept this exposition; but, modified in such a manner as to make Satan referred to as the instigator of Cain's murder, Dœderlein, Nitzsch,[2] Lücke, de Wette, Schulthess, Kling, Köstlin, Reuss have adopted it. We could not indeed agree with Olshausen's unqualified assertion that this reference to the

[1] Epiphanius paralleled further *Judas* with Cain, and others the future Antichrist. A Jewish fable gives a caricaturing echo of this truth, making Cain the offspring of Sammael's commerce with Eve. Hilgenfeld finds here a *father of the devil*, the Demiurgos, the God of the Old Testament! Nonnus thus seemed to read the καὶ ὁ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ, for he has—ψεύστης αὐτὸς ἔφυ, ψευδήμονος ἐκ γενετῆρος.

[2] In the well-known treatise, theol. Zeitschrift von Schleiermacher, de Wette, und Lücke, 1822, drittes Heft. The other view was maintained against Nitzsch by Barth and others.

isolated fact of an external murder superficialises the whole thought. For Cain's murder is, as being the first, no isolated fact, but in the significance of a primitive record, the prototype of all following murder. (Comp. on the significance of Cain at the fountain of human history, Augustin. Civ. Dei, lib. xv. cap. 5, 7.) We fully admit that an allusion to Cain is quite in keeping here, and that the whole context forces it upon us. The typical parallel between the righteous Abel and Christ, the curse-stricken, outcast Cain and the Jewish people, is based upon a deep foundation; but the various aspects of this question we decline entering upon now. We must protest, however, with all earnestness against the opinion that this is the only thing to which our Lord alluded; nor can we consent to exclude all reference to the original Fall of man.

Euthymius has united the two views, and with a very proper sentiment; Nitzsch's complaint that he has done this in a very awkward manner, applies only to his placing Adam first and Cain afterwards.[1] The truth is that our Lord refers all those who are now in a satanic spirit lusting after murder, to the first type of all who are of the Evil one, to the *first murderer* in the likeness of the great murderer—just as we find in 1 Jno. iii. 10–12, which parallel must almost have the weight of a commentary. But in this very reference he intends to direct their thoughts further back to the Devil himself, whose mind ἀπ' ἀρχῆς lusted for the death of man, and consequently to the corruption of man, of which indeed Cain was born. The exposition which refers it directly to the Fall is not indeed false, but fails in not perceiving the immediate point of connection in our Lord's discourse, through which it goes back as an inferential conclusion to the ruin of Adam.[2] In 1 Jno. iii. 8, we find *he that committeth sin* generally, standing before the allusion to Cain, and this is Adam; now if Adam's first-born son was of the Devil, we may assume that the same Devil had already wrought his

[1] Τὸν πρῶτον ἄνθρωπον κτείνας, τὸν Ἀδάμ. Αὐτὸς γὰρ αὐτῷ τὸν θάνατον ποσεξένησεν. Εἶτα καὶ τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ Ἄβελ ἀνελών· αὐτὸς γὰρ καὶ αὐτῷ τὸν ἀδελφὸν Κάϊν ἐπανέστησε κινήσας τῷ φθόνῳ. Similarly does Theod. Heracleota connect them.

[2] This Kling is somewhat disposed to admit, see Stud. u. Krit. 1836. 3. S. 669. note.

mischief upon the father of such a son. It is a very arbitrary assertion in which Baumgarten-Crusius takes refuge, that in ἀνθρωποκτόνος ἀπ' ἀρχῆς there is no more reference to an individual occurrence intended, than in ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ οὐχ ἕστηκεν—and that therefore the former is to be referred *neither* to the Fall *nor* to Cain's murder! No, the Lord reminds them evidently of the fact indeed of the first murder;[1] but it is His design to point back to one earlier than that, on this occasion *where the character of His whole discourse generally consists in His leading their thoughts to ultimate and most spiritual principles.* This of itself seems sufficient reason for not interpreting the whole solely of Cain. Lange well protests against the alternative between the two expositions. "The passage manifestly goes back to the Fall, and seizes the murder of man as effected by Satan, in its actual origination. But since Cain's act first brought it to an open manifestation, this also must be regarded as included in the reference to what Satan did at the beginning." This is incorrect only in the order of reference, like Euthymius: it should be,—"The reference to the first manifested murder is included in the allusion to its deeper root and principle."

Nitzsch and Lücke misapprehend the profound and comprehensive nature of this spiritual discourse, when the former says —"To involve the first perversion of man, is to interrupt the internal parallelism of its consecutive thoughts," and the latter—"the Devil was doubtless a murderer of man in the spiritual sense,[2] as he brought sin into the world, but this thought disturbs the connection, since spiritual murder could not here be alluded to in reference to Christ." Excluding this, the reference to their intention to kill Christ would be much too strongly emphasised; for it only furnishes a point of connection for a

[1] With Nitzsch: "to a definite primitive historical fact, which bore to the murderous lust and activity of the devil, the relation of *beginning* and first external manifestation." Jul. Müller remarks truly that the narrative of that brother's murder contains not the slightest hint of a seducing influence exerted upon Cain"—and refers Nitzsch to the similar ἀπ' ἀρχῆς of 1 Jno. iii. 8. But neither must it be forgotten that the murderous mind of Satan broke out in Cain after a most special manner, and, as it were, became incarnate.

[2] In the sense, that is, of the book of Wisd. ch. ii. 24; comp. with ch. i. 12, 13.

perfect and exhaustive characterisation of Satan, the true and complete *historia diaboli.* And then—as if in the Scriptures the spiritual meaning was not always the fundamental meaning! as if here, and amid the circumstances in which He spoke, the Lord would characterise Satan in so transcendently significant a manner, merely in connection with an accomplished *bodily* murder. The exclusive reference to Cain, we are now compelled to say, weakens the Lord's great utterance, which penetrates to the true ἀρχή of sin and ἴδεα of the devil.

The essential point in the work of Nitzsch, already quoted, raises not so much an exegetical as a dogmatic question; it is not so much a defence of a special exegesis, as an attack upon a dogma which the opposite exposition establishes, or the scriptural *view* of it which is held by others. Hence, he places "the relation of this description to the debateable facts in the Scriptural primitive history of man, regarded in itself," among the critical points which must be settled before the "connection of our Lord's discourse." Nitzsch concedes that "the sin which caused mortality is itself a kind of dying," that the Fall is in a sense death,—*but* cannot reconcile it with the New Testament teaching that the tempter whose guilt entered into it should be exhibited as a murderer." Wherefore not? It would require, indeed, a treatise longer than his own to confute all the deeply pondered arguments of such a man; that being impossible we must attempt briefly to supply its place. He is in a certain sense right, that Adam, man generally in him, did not *wholly die;*—"that the enemy may be said rather to have made an assault upon man's life, than to have entirely and finally triumphed over it." But after all, is not such an assault, even without success, an actual murder in the judgment of God? Is not the ζητεῖν or θέλειν ποιεῖν reckoned as the accomplished deed? Is it not on that account that our Lord speaks in such precise and measured terms of the ἐπιθυμίαις of the Devil, before he mentions the fact by which he became an actual and manifest ἀνθρωποκτόνος? Here we have united, to use Nitzsch's own words, "the murderous inclination and energy, with the *beginning* and open announcement of it."[1] But when he goes on to

[1] His System, § 117, renders it doubtful whether this estimable writer designs to modify his views as expressed in that treatise.

maintain that "in the exposition of the Adamite Fall the New Testament does not involve the question of spiritual death or murder"—we must be allowed, in the name of the New Testament quite otherwise understood, to utter an entire contradiction. His error is partly in laying too much stress upon the result of the ἀνθρωποκτονία, too little upon the design contemplated in it; and in adhering nevertheless too closely to bodily "mortality."[1] The state of death in sin which Christ and His apostles ascribe to the natural man, independently of the intervening grace which never left him from the beginning, is regarded as "having reference not so much to a lost and extinguished life, as to a life not yet attained." And here we have the dogmatic point of divergence between our respective views of the Scriptural doctrine. The one makes Adam's sin rather a checking of development, or a diverting it into the way of grace through sin; the other, which is ours, regards it as a *Fall* in the strongest sense of the term, out of a life infused of God into *the* "death" which is inseparably identical with "sin."

We appeal once more, on behalf of this latter view as applicable also to Adam, to 1 John iii. 8, as also to ver. 15 of that chapter, since Adam, who had no brother to hate, did at least in hatred instead of love repel and proscribe to judgment the wife given to him as a helpmate, Gen. iii. 12. We hold confidently to the assurance, that Christ, in the full meaning of the doctrine derived directly from the Old Testament as we find it in Wisd. ii. 23, 24 compared with i. 11–13, terms Satan a murderer

[1] Asserting it to be contrary to sound religious feeling to term that hurt of mortality an ἀνθρωποκτονία, which had been only mediately inflicted upon man by Satan, and which by intervening grace had been established as a law and transformed into a benefit (quite correctly, אִשָּׁה Gen. iii. 15). But it is still more contrary to our exegetical feeling that Christ's words should be restricted here to the mere external manifestation of bodily death and murder. The words מָוֶת and θάνατος are scarcely anywhere, that is, when dogmatically used, denuded of their spiritual reference. It is a very false view, which even Jul. Müller upholds, that it is not spiritual but bodily death which the record of Genesis iii. and the subsequent use of it in the New Testament, derive from the fall of our first parents! Bodily death would assuredly signify nothing, and would not be truly death, if it had not its ground in death spiritual.

from the beginning;[1] that He does, indeed, introduce this in connection with a more immediate reference to Cain, but regards this *Cainite murder typically*, as pointing forward to all individual hatred and actual murder in the future, and in its *backward* reference as the first achieved result and fearfully speedy manifestation of the lust of Satan—of his desire, that is, so to ruin and destroy man spiritually, as that he might like Satan himself manifest and confirm by murder his own internal death. It is not that the "devil bears the guilt of all the individual results of death in the world," as the good Roos improperly says; but he bears, according to his own design and deed in the first attack upon humanity, the guilt of that great and most essential Fall into death, out of which God saves and restores to life, as Adam, Abel, and Seth, so also all who are penitent and believe. We appeal against Nitzsch in favour of this meaning of ἀνθρωποκτόνος to the universal type of scriptural teaching. As von Gerlach says: "It is never expressly made prominent in Holy Scripture that the devil seduced Cain and such as he to commit murder; but it is even said that death entered into the world through the devil's lie—Ye shall not surely die."

It is now time to examine more closely the accompanying words. And first the ἦν (for which we must not with Klee read ἐστί), the sound of which indicates that the Lord is pointing backwards from the ἀνθρωποκτονία which startled His hearers: —See, this *was* he ever, *in this he fully betrayed* what he had been and what he had lusted for from the beginning! Furthermore, the ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, which does not directly mean—"this was his first act, to murder man;" nor is it to be interpreted as simply an ἀρχαῖον, occurring between the creation and the deluge—"that first murder, in the beginnings of history, was his work." But it means here as in Matt. xix. 4—from the beginning of known human history, from the time when men were for him to murder, since he first—who already before existed, ἦν—appeared and attacked the human race.[2] The ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ἁμαρτάνει, 1

[1] Comp. the passage quoted from Sohar chadasch, according to which the נָחָשׁ הַקַּדְמוֹנִי whose children the wicked are, killed—קַשְׁיָל—*Adam* and all sprung from him.

[2] Not, assuredly,—from the beginning of the creature; as Lampe assentingly quotes. Nonnus: ἐξότε κόσμου ἐξ ἀρχῆς τετέλεστο θεμείλιον. From

Jno. iii. 8, is spoken with the same reference to men, and that which is known to man; pausing before the dark portals of the first preadamite fall of spirits—through which, however, we shall see that our Lord gives us here a dim yet impressive glance.

"The world is a den of murderers, under the Devil's rule. If we would live in it we must be content to be guests, and in an inn where the host is a knave, and over the door of which is the sign—To Murder and Lying. Christ Himself set that mark over the door, when He said that he was a murderer and a liar. A murderer, to destroy the body, or liar, to ruin the soul. This is his business, this is what goes on in his hostelry." These words of Luther may serve to introduce the next expressions, though we are not to regard him as being rigorously exegetical in applying murder to the body, lying to the soul. We should rather say that the lie, which is first negatively the not standing in the truth, then positively the bringing forth in speech and act of its own, is the deeper and earlier internal or spiritual principle of all corrupting and destroying act, the most essential *sinfulness* of sin. Inasmuch as the ἀνθρωποκτονία indicates an external manifestation in act, there must correspond to it and causally precede it, an internal condition; and it is *this* of which the Lord, looking further back, proceeds to speak.[1] It is scarcely a delusion, that we regard this ψεύστης in immediate connection with the ἀνθρωποκτόνος as referring to the first lie revealed in the primitive record, the great fundamental lie of the deceiver.[2] *By*

which that strange doctrine would follow which makes Satan fall immediately on his creation. Comp. Aug. civ. Dei. xi. c. 13. See the right view, agreeing with our own, in Hofmann, Schriftbeweis, I. 377, 378.

[1] Jul. Müller (I. 195) differently expounds this dichotomy. "The *lie* is the cowardice of selfishness, *hatred* its proud overflow. But both mutually develop themselves; *hatred springs from lying*—from aversion to the truth comes rage against him who represents it; *hatred begets lying*, because it finds it needful for the accomplishment of its ends." Quite true. But Christ here places ψεῦδος in evident contrast with the divine ἀλήθεια, as the inmost and first principle of evil. Comp. Nitzsch System § 105, where, strangely enough, the dictum classicum of Jno. viii. is unalluded to.

[2] It might be hard to find in Cain's history a positive and evident illustration of the lie! But in a *spiritual sense* it is true that Satan did not so much murder Abel through Cain, as Cain himself by the lie which misled

lying to murder, was the Enemy's lust and first act—thus did he encounter man as the only object of his attack between the inaccessible angels and the evil spirits who shared his fall. But in this, finally, he revealed himself as one who had *become* a liar *out of himself*, contrary to the truth of God in which he must have been created; his lying contradiction to the word and commandment of God exhibits him to us as one who had already fallen from the truth of God, in a *previous beginning* beyond the ἀρχή of men.

And does the Lord then really intimate this ultimate fact? Does He give us in this οὐχ ἕστηκεν a definite utterance (more definite and explicit than Lu. x. 18) concerning the fall of Satan? That is, may we translate with Luther—*er ist nicht bestanden;* with the Vulg. *non stetit*, i.e., *non perstitit;* with the Eng. vers. *abode not;* and the Dutch *en is in de waerheyt niet staende gebleven?*[1] The philologists forbid it, because of the Greek idiom according to which ἕστηκα has only a present signification; indeed, the older Greek fathers acknowledge this, and their judgment has its weight. And Mayer (Hist. diaboli p. 164)—non tam *lapsum* quam *statum* diaboli describi a Christo putes. Neander regards Christ as giving here the definite idea of Satan, as the spirit estranged from truth and goodness, "lie and sin having become his second nature; he *stands* not in the truth, and can find no resting-place there." Nearly so Bengel[2] —Non assecutus est statum in veritate; and after him v. Gerlach —"he finds no footing, no resting-place in the truth, because his

him to kill Abel. See in 1 Jno. iii., where the murderers are exhibited as being in death and murdering themselves! Thus did Satan, too, *will* to destroy the second Adam; that is, his enmity, hardly tempting His love, would have cast Him out of His life in God.

[1] A writer, who outwits himself, perverted this in his Versuch einer biblischen Dämonologie, as follows—"The views of him and his power have never been founded upon truth. Οὐκ ἔστιν ἀλήθεια ἐν αὐτῷ, there is no truth in the Devil and in the Jewish notions concerning him." See this contemptible criticism in Mayer Hist. Diaboli, p. 149. The existence of the idea is an argument of the existence of the reality, for "Satan could be invented by none but Satan." (Daub, Judas Ischarioth, II. 411.)

[2] Who, moreover, incorrectly supposes—hoc comma cupiditatem homicidii memoratam *non antecedit*, sed sequitur.

inmost being is alienated from it." This would make his case parallel with that of these his children, who seem at first to be πεπιστευκότες, but do not stand fast in the word of truth and *cannot* give it place in their hearts. Bengel's view, as we see, has a certain bias towards the past sense; and in Lange this is still more marked—"he did not take his stand in the truth;" or in Beck (Lehrwissensch. I. 255)—"one who did not establish himself and take his position in the truth of life." What can we say better than Olshausen's words—"We must be driven to a view of the words very similar to the ancient interpretation of Satan's apostasy; and this admits of a grammatical vindication. Ἕστηκα has the signification of *enduring*, as Lücke and Tholuck acknowledge. The declaration 'He abideth not in the truth' does not, indeed, explicitly assert his fall, but contains it implicitly. Only that the fall of Satan is not so much regarded as an isolated fact, but as a continuous conduct and state." This last point may admit of doubt: Nitzsch admits that the οὐχ ἕστηκεν "points to a *fact* apart from the history of the fall, and out of the domain of history generally." The expression of Jude, ver. 6, is more direct—μὴ τηρήσαντες τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἀρχὴν; and Nonnus may be thought to have arbitrarily altered and added to the words *here*—οὐδ' ἐνὶ θεσμῷ μίμνεν ἀληθείης θεοπειθέος; yet we cannot but trace in the origination of that use of the word which is too much pressed on the opposite side, the notion of *abiding* in a former fixed place.[1] And if we take this root of the expression, this ἕστηκε indicates an ἀρχή in which he was created in the truth, who now stands οὐκ ἐν ἀληθείᾳ; inferring in this great mystery the *lapsus* from the *status*.[2] Instead of many passages which have been unfoundedly quoted, we would point to Acts xxvi. 22, where the ἕστηκα with the ἄχρι must be interpreted—*I have held firm and continued.* This is certainly something other than the mere οὐκ ἐμμένει, οὐκ ἀναπαύεται of

[1] Hence Sept. for עמד, Nahum i. 6; Mal. iii. 2.

[2] So that Martensen (Dogmatik i. 224) simply says—"this *beginning* of his fall it is which the Lord here hints at when he says that the Devil did not abide in the truth." And again (S. 227) he shows that "father of the lie" can only signify an intelligence, a personal self-consciousness. We do not, however, understand father of the lie, but of every liar as being the first—which comes to the same thing.

Euthymius, or the "relation of an eternal centrifugal repulsion" in Klee.—Thus we escape at least from the undogmatical and untheosophical rigour of the Present,[1] which would make the Lord *only* say—"he falleth ever away from the truth," and *only* characterise (according to Lücke) the *ἰδίωμα* of the Devil as being an eternal *falling away*, without any intimation of that first fact of original *apostasy*, which must be presupposed to any unbiassed apprehension. Such a rigorously present description or characterisation, cutting off all reference to an originally good created character, would tend to open the way for the great Manichæan error, or serve as its apology. But the Lord could not so speak; and therefore introduces the *ἀλήθεια* of God in connection with the abstract *possibility* of Satan being in it and it being in him; and further, gives us in the *οὐχ ἕστηκε*, as we cannot but apprehend, a positive allusion to an original *actual* being in this *ἀληθείᾳ* on the part of this present *ψεύστης*.

As he *now is*, and as he *has been* from the beginning of our history, it is said of him—*οὐκ ἔστιν ἀλήθεια ἐν αὐτῷ*. Spoken of Satan, this has an infinitely deeper meaning than when it is said of unfaithful men (as in the passage sometimes compared 1 Macc. vii. 18)—*οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν αὐτοῖς ἀληθεία*; or (as might have been more aptly cited) in Deut. xxxii. 20, לֹא־אֱמֻן בָּם, there is no truth in them (Sept. *πίστις*), no sincerity corresponding to truth and which may be relied upon. The change in the form of expression gives us this meaning:—*because* he abideth not and hath not abode in the truth, therefore the truth cannot be in him; just as previously in vers. 31 and 37. For the truth is here, in the second as in the first clause,[2] the objective truth of God, not the subjective sincerity of the creature; the latter is only included as the ground of the subsequent lying, since it follows as the necessary consequence that from him in whom the truth is not, there can proceed no truth; he cannot speak *it* but lie only.[3] Hence it follows at once, that we must take the *ὅτι* not ætiologically but syllogistically. Thus did Augustin regard it (de civ. Dei, xi., c. 14): Subjecit autem *indicium*, quasi quæsissemus, *unde ostendatur*, quod in veritate non steterit. So

[1] As Lücke repeats it against Martensen: Deutsche Zeitschrift, 1851.

[2] Although Lücke and many others deny this.

[3] As his deeds everywhere bring *death*, so his words breathe out lying.

Calvin, Beza, and Lampe; the latter appealing to Glassius for this undeniable use of ὅτι. It is according to Piscator an argumentum ab affectu, nor do we find in it anything "forced." He is *in fact*, as all his deeds and words from the beginning show, bare of all truth: this is the evidence of an οὐχ ἕστηκεν, of a falling at his beginning into that condition from another; and so "not" is almost equivalent to "no longer." But the ἐστίν ἐν αὐτῷ should not be weakened, as Hezel weakens it: "Truth was never any matter of his—and never is—nor is it to be sought in him!" But this *most internal* truthfulness makes the transition to the ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων in this compact and strictly connected series of positions.

"When he speaketh the lie"—can therefore by no means be an admission that he sometimes may speak the truth; for here the well-known saying holds true—If the devil speaks the truth that is his foulest lie. But the λαλεῖν τὸ ψεῦδος in connection with ὅταν recognises his abiding, systematic, and sole manner of acting. It comes *out of his own*, he acts and speaks thus because he cannot and will not do otherwise, because he is essentially a liar. But the explanation—"consistent with his character"—is not enough: nor is de Wette's translation—"in his proper kind." The individuality or personal self-character of this creature sundered from God, and opposing himself to God, is here declared to be the element of lying and sin, in which he was not created, but into which he had fallen. Could the Lord speak more plainly to understanding ears and attentive minds? Could words have been chosen more precisely adapted to distinguish between the Devil himself, and his deluded and enslaved children? For in their case as such the lie is not so absolutely and wholly their own, self-chosen element; they have become subject to it through the deceitfulness of Satan, whom alone no predecessor had ensnared and led astray.

Finally, there are two methods of expounding the last word. The greater part of the commentators, ancient and modern, refer αὐτοῦ to ψεῦδος;[1] and Nitzsch pronounces this *necessary*. This ψεῦδος is either found in the distance of the previous clause (as by Glassius, referring to Acts viii. 26, where, however, αὕτη

[1] Martensen was named before. Also Daub, Judas Ischarioth I. 203.

does not apply to the way but to Gaza); or, less harshly, with Winer is regarded as latent in the concrete ψεύστης, and brought forward again as its abstract in a manner the converse of Rom. ii. 26.[1] This would suit very well, but we cannot see the necessity for it; the reference to ψεύστης itself, which Lücke regards as more obviously grammatical, is certainly not more harsh, when we take into account the very concise and unusual character of this discourse. The difficulty is simply that of taking this word, the predicate of the Devil, immediately as an abstract or collective term—the liar generally, or every liar. "We may hesitate to say which is the more difficult sense of the two"—true enough.[2] Lücke finds nothing inappropriate in construing πατήρ with the *abstract* ψεῦδος; but we think it very unapt in this connection, where the aim and gist of the whole discourse is to evince these men to be children of the Devil. Oetinger's words are very pregnant: Satan has not only spoken but begotten the lie—but still πατήρ must here have reference to persons, in order to lead back to ver. 38. We have already in our general analysis shown that the conclusion following upon the strictly logical process of the whole argument, must be—"Consequently *ye* are children of the Devil—ye, who oppose to My truth the lie of which ye are conscious in your hearts, with enmity against Myself which stops not short of the desire to kill Me." Thus the connection demands this sense. (Bengel: et pater cujusvis mendacis.) Meyer and Lange hold to this; Baumgarten-Crusius modifies it somewhat after the example of Erasmus' ejus rei—of *such like*, but with personal reference to ψεύστης; thus—he who lies is his son. Let it be noted how graciously the Lord pretermits at the close the direct address!

Vers. 45, 46. We have already pointed out the retrogressive character of the argument here which strengthens itself by most emphatic repetition. The Lord majestically opposes His own ἐγώ, as of one τὴν ἀλήθειαν λέγων (mark the subtile change—not λαλῶν), to the archliar and all his progeny. Not to believe *Him*,[3]

[1] So Erasmus—pater ejus rei.

[2] At any rate De Wette is not justified in declaring the reference to ψεύστης impossible.

[3] This believing *Him* is the lower degree as in ch. v. 46, x. 37. Comp. the Baptist's words, ch. iii. 36, where we have both at once, and on which

and *because*, not ὅταν but ὅτι, He telleth them the truth, is on their part a wilful opposition after the Devil's manner. And then comes the sublime and so much contested *evidence* that He speaketh the truth, derived from His *sinlessness* as exhibited before themselves and challenging their ἐλέγχειν περὶ ἁμαρτίας! The history of the exposition of this word presents us with a remarkable phenomenon. The apparent obviousness of the meaning as derived from the connection deluded most of the ancient expositors; but in later times they have penetrated with general consent to a deeper and more appropriate interpretation of our Lord's meaning.

Because ἁμαρτία stands in contrast both with the preceding and subsequent ἀλήθεια, it was thought impossible to evade the conclusion that the meaning must be—Who can convince Me of error? Thus Origen: τὰ λεγόμενα ἡμαρτημένα; and Cyril with more definite and express opposition. So Calvin, Beza, Melanchthon, and alas Bengel too: me errare et a veritate abesse! And thus interpret, as we might suppose, Wolf, Kypke, Morus; Fritzsche also against Ullmann (who incorrectly appeals to 1 Cor. xv. 34 and Tit. iii. 11); Strauss too of course; and even J. v. Müller, putting it in the worst form—"Can ye prove against Me any error in My conclusions?"[1] Tholuck makes the pertinent remark that if this had been His meaning the Lord would in this connection have opposed ψεῦδος to the truth. Many, from Cyril down to Fritzsche, have interpreted it—de fraude;[2] as may be found literally in a lexicon of the New Testament. Lampe tries to extricate himself by the vague and insipid observation:—ἁμαρτία hic latissime est accipienda pro

Roos excellently comments:—He who believeth not the Son, as a Teacher *who tells him* that he should believe *on Him*.

[1] Brandt's Schullehrerbibel decks out this view to the utmost by laying the stress upon the ἐλέγχει—who can *demonstrate* that I am incorrect, that I am in error? They never in their contests with Him adduced any *proof*. But this would be still more doubtful, since it is well known that among the contentious the judgment as to sufficiency of reasons is altogether obscured. Christ may challenge sinners to convince Him of any sin; but to demand from them *proof* against the *truth*, even hypothetically, is altogether *unseemly*.

[2] Baumgarten-Crusius speaks strangely of a deception of the people, which arrogated a higher meaning to itself!

quocunque defectu morali, *etiam levissimo*, nec solum pro vitio in factis, sed etiam pro *errore in verbis*—according to Jas. iii. 2. Fikenscher comes independently to the same conclusion: "Jesus represents every defection from the pure truth as a sin against God!"

But at the very outset, as Lücke protests—"How feeble would it sound, if He had asked: Or do I speak any untruth, is there any error which ye can allege?" Especially after having by ὅτι maintained that He spoke the truth![1] Moreover, how utterly does that interpretation forsake the *Scriptural* meaning of ἁμαρτία in this chapter, as found throughout the whole Gospel, the entire New Testament, and all the Scriptures! St John must, in consistency with his phraseology, have set down πλάνη or ψεῦδος. Have we not in ver. 34 ἁμαρτία in contrast with the *truth*, which makes free from sin? Has not the Lord just been showing how *falsehood* and *sin* are connected together, as derived from the Devil? And are not *in His own case* the two things essentially and necessarily connected, that He did no sin, and spake only truth,—just as in all His testimony to Himself He always combines together His ποιεῖν and λέγειν? Kling makes a further objection to Lücke's view: "He makes the sense to be, that the only thing which would justify them in not believing Him, would be the possibility of their alleging and proving Him to be a sinner; since He could lay claim to their acknowledgment of Him as Christ, only on the supposition of their trusting in His moral purity." This Kling will not allow, since the truth which was disbelieved was not His declaration concerning His own being, but His complaint of their sin; and he therefore substitutes:—"I challenge you to point out any defection in Me from the path of the Divine will, and thus to make it plain that I unrighteously oppose Myself as the true Son abiding in the house to you as the slaves of sin." This more definite reference may admit of discussion, but it does not touch the main point that ἁμαρτία means *sin*, and not error, oversight, or wrong conclusion. But we do not altogether echo

[1] Compare Ullmann's vindication, Stud. u. Krit., 1842, 3, 674 ff. De Wette brings forward a sound reason why ἁμαρτία, like ἀδικία, ch. vii. 18, cannot be error. According to that supposition, *faith* would be the fruit of reflecting test.

Luther:[1] "Christ here graciously demands of them the cause wherefore they do not believe, since they can find nothing to blame either in His *life* or in His *doctrine*. His life is unblamable, for He says—who can convince Me of sin? His doctrine is also unimpeachable, for He says—Thus I tell you the truth," etc. But the great point is *this*, that the sinless life is made valid *proof* of the truth of the doctrine;[2] and this itself is a great and profound truth which penetrates and convinces every conscience, and to *prove* which in this place, where it is so dogmatically asserted, is beyond our present province. See in addition what was said upon ch. vii. 18.

Undoubtedly, this does not assert directly the absolute sinlessness of Christ, since men as such, and especially these His enemies, could not look into the heart; and the most unimpeachable external life might yet conceal sin visible to God. But in the whole treatment of this question in later times, much stress has been laid upon the truth that *Christ* could only have uttered such a challenge, in the perfect consciousness of His own sinlessness before God. In truth, He speaks it absolutely and definitely and solemnly; He does not affect before men the semblance of sinlessness! From any other lips than His own, such a declaration could be sincere and permissible only when referred to external sins which may be alleged; but when He so speaks it would be *sin* if there were in His mind any reserve of sinful consciousness; this very word would be sin! He who does not *feel* this is not to be argued with; and we wonder at Ullmann's patience in discussing the points with those who are ἐξ ἐριθείας.

What humility, once more, appears in this dignity! He submits to be rebuked by these sinners, if they can convince Him! comp. ch. xviii. 23.[3] As the Holy One of Israel (Zeph. iii. 5;

[1] See his sermon in the collection of Niethammer.

[2] Assuredly thus, and not conversely, as Teschendorff (Nikodemus, S. 118, 119) labours to maintain, in order to reconcile exegesis with dogmatics: - Where there is no defection from the truth, there it must be concluded that sin does not exist! In that case, as de Wette says, faith would be the fruit of reflective test; and even *in us* as certain a criterion for *such* testing of truth-speaking, as the *conscience* certainly is for the sin-rebuking truth of the Holy One.

[3] Where, however, the καχῶς or καλῶς touches the sinfulness of His so answering, not the untruth of what was said.

Deut. xxxii. 4), He stands and waits their accusation. We are to suppose here a sublime pause to intervene. He has put the question and is silent. They also are silent; their slanderous spirits have not a word to allege in His presence. His question was redoubled: "Am I a sinner? If not a sinner, but True, *wherefore, wherefore* believe ye not Me? (Who hath bewitched you, that ye will not obey the truth? Gal. iii. 1. The answer comes from 1 Sam. xv. 23—The Devil as the arch-deceiver!)

Ver. 47. He then takes up the word again: "I will answer *for you* to the *second question*, since ye have answered the first by your silence. What I have *said* to you is *true*, and it is now the only answer—He who is of God heareth the words of God; *therefore* ye hear them not, because ye are not of God. The sublimest argument of God's speaker confronting unbelieving men, and in the simplest possible words! It is the condensation of all His sayings in this chapter from ver. 14 downwards; specially a final conclusion repeated from ver. 37, but repeated in the gentle negative form—not of God. The Evangelist cites this great decisive Word for all the future of the world and of the church in his first Epistle, ch. iv. 6.

The Jews are smitten by the truth which fell upon them from the lips of the sinless Son of man; and should have been overcome by the most gentle tenderness with which His rigorous truth opposes *their* sin; by the profound humility with which the Son of God confronts their pride. But they do not yield as vanquished; they do not sink into silence; but rather begin in good earnest now—to revile and blaspheme. St John here mentions "*the Jews*," otherwise than in vers. 33, 39, and thus indicates that they are not the πεπιστευκότες who now take up the word, but the most malicious and virulent who represent the mass. The raising of objections is at an end; and the arrogant men who had been listening for a while in restrained vexation, now come forward, determined to retaliate in yet fiercer invective the contempt which He had cast upon the seed of Abraham. And their words are the delayed answer to ver. 46—but what an answer do they give! What contradiction of sinners is here (Heb. xii. 3)! The two words of scorn which

they give vent to have a manifest allusion to the Lord's two inculpations, and this gives them their distinctive meaning. *Thou hast*—not *the* devil, but *a devil.* This is, indeed, the current formula provided by their vocabulary for madness by possession, especially of the evil spirit of pride: but the word here has not the same meaning as in ch. vii. 20, x. 20. "Thou art a fool, or fanatic" would be much too little; "Thou art possessed by a spirit of pride" would also come far short of the meaning, after "Samaritan." They deepen their emphasis just as the Lord had done—not from *Abraham*, not from *God.* Perfectly to give back His second reproach would have required—"Thou mayest Thyself be of the Devil, his son and not the son of our God!" But neither their accustomed phraseology, nor their present daring, extends as far as the utterance of such a word; they content themselves with *δαιμόνιον ἔχειν*, intending it to signify this much, at least:—Thou who speakest thus art more likely to be in league with Satan. Thus they cast Him out of the fellowship of the God of Israel in the latter word; even as in the former they had cast Him out of the fellowship of Israel.

For it is obvious that this is what they mean by *Samaritan*, a term far surpassing in contemptuousness the formerly used "Galilæan." Thou art a heretic—"one who knoweth not the God of Israel, and denieth Israel's orthodox faith."[1] This was the term of foulest scorn which they could apply to any individual, and nothing but *δαιμόνιον ἔχειν* could follow it. The later Jewish writings abound with the most extravagant expressions of this kind, which we need not now quote; and Eisenmenger i. 633, 634, has shown that the Christians were afterwards called Cuthites (כּוּתִיִּים from כּוּתָה, 2 Kings xvii. 24), this word being equivalent to גּוֹיִים.[2] The point, however, of their malicious daring lies in the question placed before both words of reproach, and which He was to answer with yes—*οὐ καλῶς λέγομεν*; this may indeed be softened, with Bengel—cum aliquâ adhuc formidine horrendam contumeliam pronunciant; as if the question betrayed some lingering uncertainty. But we prefer to give it

[1] Origen: *ὡς παραχαράσσοντα Ἰουδαϊκὰ παραπλησίως τοῖς Σαμαρείταις.*

[2] The Talmud says, *e.g.* (Tract. Jebamoth fol. 47)—a Cuthite can be no *witness!* which is very pertinent to this passage.

in its rigour with Grotius—nonne merito inter nos dicere solemus; or with Baumgarten-Crusius—*Have* we not said rightly? This last interpretation suits, strictly speaking, only the second calumny which had been before uttered; but in their wilful rage they apply it to both—as if it had been a long settled question with them, that He was a Samaritan!

Jesus now begins the last part of this colloquy by asserting against the ἀτιμάζειν of their reckless scorn, the honour which was laid upon Him by the Father, including His own Divine dignity, in such a manner that their *three* contradictory words are gently but mostly clearly replied to. He answers their first word in ver. 48 by the three precisely corresponding clauses of ver. 49, and then in vers. 50, 51 His most condescending patience vindicates the testimony which He had borne, by declaring that He spake it not for His honour, but for their salvation. Their second rejoinder, vers. 52, 53, which springs from the word with which He closes, He replies to in vers. 54–56, taking their objections in their backward order. This requires Him, finally, to place Abraham, who was dead, in his true relation to Himself, the Giver, according to His Divinity, of eternal life.

Ver. 49. The answer in these words advances backwards to its climax: and this must be carefully observed for the right apprehension of its individual expressions. Thou hast a Devil —*I have not a Devil!* Thou art a Samaritan—*I honour My Father!* Say we not rightly—*Nay, ye do dishonour Me!* How luminous, and how full of repose is this reply! "Oh that men would learn from the Lord Jesus how, in tranquil repose in the will of their heavenly Father, to defend the truth." (Rieger.)

But what gentleness too—the more daring and insolent His opponents, the more mild and humble is He! This "*I have not a Devil*" is the type and model of all future reviling not again —1 Pet. ii. 23, comp. Acts xxvi. 25. But He does not go on to say—And I am not a Samaritan—for two reasons. Lampe gives us one in a graceful though subtle form—cum jam inter Samaritanos haberet, qui in eum credebant. Or, as we may put it with more precision—How could He take this name of mockery, which involved in contempt a people called to salva-

tion, upon His lips; and by repelling it sanction the injustice done to those, many of whom He had already treated with grace? See, with what most scrupulous care His truth and His love avoid entering for a moment into the impure element of their polemical language![1] To our minds there is another reason which also has its force. The repeated retort—*No*, it is not as ye say! would have given the appearance of excitement and passion to His reply. Instead of that, He passes over into the style of teaching and vindication—I honour My Father! Lücke well says—"For I announce only His word, and His truth," and therefore am no heretical teacher of error, such as ye would describe Me by the word *Samaritan*. In the gently maintained assertion of the Present ἀλλὰ τιμῶ, however, it is at the same time declared—"I cannot speak otherwise, I *must* speak to you as I have spoken for the honour of God; I must testify against your God-dishonouring sin and lie, and similarly assert the truth *for My own person*." So that it is both: I only indicate God's honour against you—"I justify Myself only against invective,"[2] and this only because your insult lights upon the *Father* in Me His Son. Thus it is not in the madness of pride, but in obligatory *obedience*, that I discharge the duty of My mission. But *ye* (the same antithesis as in their ἡμεῖς and σύ!) say not καλῶς what ye say, but dishonour—one might expect My Father or God, but instead of that—*Me!* For the accusation that *they* denied God His honour was already included in the previous clause; and He is constrained now further to intimate "that the Father's honour and His own are one and the same thing"—as Luther here says. In deep *sorrow*, which is one with gentleness, He utters this; for His pure Divine consciousness *resents* humanly the insults cast upon Himself and His Father. Ἀτιμάζειν has a softer meaning here than *e.g.* in Luke xx. 11; for the Lord, or St John according to His meaning, prefers the general indefinite, and, as much as might be, negative word; says not ὀνειδίζετε or λοιδορεῖτε, but abides by the pure antithesis of His τιμῷ. The reading ἠτιμάσατε (which the Vulg. and Erasmus adopt) has

[1] The explanation of Roos is not enough; to wit, that He did not reply to the imputation of being a Samaritan, because His adherence to the Jewish worship was a sufficient vindication.

[2] Which alone Baumgarten-Crusius makes prominent.

no external grounds of support: and it would refer the Lord's protest, which is urged against their disposition and life generally, too specifically to the particular words of invective which they had used. Finally, the καί between the second and the third clause belongs to the consummate peacefulness and mildness of the words of His victorious benignity. It is not to be resolved as—*Although* ye dishonour Me, this does not prevent Me from honouring the Father; nor is it to be interpreted as a more severe accusation—*And nevertheless* ye revile Me! But it is designedly a simple *and*, which points out the threefold gradation of the reply, and declares that all is even so in spite of their contradiction.—Choose, ye contradicters of this day, who will not honour the Son as ye honour the Father, believing His own testimony—take your choice in the dilemma of this chapter. Whether are the Jews right, or He! There is no third and intermediate opinion imaginable. He who does not worship in Jesus the Son of God, and yet does not perceive in Him a δαιμόνιον teaching error, and inspiring Him with fanatical presumption, has not thought deeply upon this chapter, has not heard and read its sayings to any purpose.

Vers. 50, 51. This calm assertion is followed by a renewed and unwearied appeal, which, while strictly connected with what precedes, introduces a new justification, warning, and entreaty. The justification is the already often vindicated absence of self-glorification; the warning points to the future judgment; the entreaty returns this time too into an offer of eternal life! Even as every sincerely pious servant of God would be at the utmost remove from presumptuous and self-assuming error and fanaticism, so Jesus also sought not His own honour—not *although* but *because* He knows that the Father hath honoured and will honour Him. Ζητῶν still refers most assuredly to τὴν δόξαν, and reminds us of chap. v. 23. The Father's *will is*, that men should honour the Son, and therefore bears *testimony* to Him (chap. v. 31, 32); but on that very account He will one day *demand* it of those who now refuse. (Deut. xviii. 19, אָנֹכִי אֶדְרֹשׁ מֵעִמּוֹ.) All these significations of ζητεῖν are wrapped up in one great idea; but the last (as *e.g.* 2 Chron. xxiv. 22) makes the transition to the κρίνων. But we are not to make δόξαν again the complement of this latter word, for this would be con-

trary to the language;[1] but rather—God My Father will *judge* in what concerns Me, between Me and you, in regard to your ἀτιμάζειν. And here it is perfectly natural that, without contradicting chap. v. 22, the judgment is in this case left with the Father;[2] for the Son of man humbly places Himself as one party confronting His slanderers before the tribunal of Him who will judge rightly, and to whom He commits His cause, as any other righteous servant. (Ps. xliii. 1.)

We are not to understand a pause between vers. 51 and 52; but the strictest connection subsists,—as we have shown before. I seek not Mine own honour in all the words which have provoked your wrath, but *your salvation*, your deliverance from *death!* Entirely in the sense of chap. v. 34. Do not *judgment* and *eternal life* belong to each other in this passage as in that? God will judge them who persistently refuse to honour Me by believing My words, in the day when He makes manifest My glory; but I would save you from this great evil, and pluck you from the hands of the liar and the *murderer*.[3] The gracious promise, uttered so often before, stands here in reminding connection with vers. 21–24 of this chapter. The Lord begins again to attract and beseech them: it is as even Lampe says a novum tentamen gratiæ.[4] The τηρεῖν of ver. 51 (שׁמר, Sept. τηρεῖν and φυλάσσειν) has been by some inappropriately limited to those believers who are to be presupposed as having already accepted and admitted His words. Hence Teschendorff: "The Lord here turns away from His opponents, to those who had exhibited faith in His word." But such a distribution disturbs

[1] But not with Allioli, uniting the two absolutely,—there is One that seeketh and judgeth.

[2] Not in the sense of the words of a Rationalist—In all the dogmatic of Jesus *God* remains ever the *Judge*.

[3] So little fellowship have I with Satan, who promise and give *life*. This allusion, remarked upon by Augustin and Beza, is safer than the questionable observation of Bengel. Epiphanius makes the Samaritans to have been —Sadducees!

[4] It is by no means *unnatural* (as de Wette thinks) that Jesus should make this sudden utterance to those who were radically unsusceptible. "After a pause, and weary of strife," He is regarded as having turned again to the believers of ver. 31. Weary of *strife*, indeed,—we have nothing to say against that; but not weary in His seeking love.

the profound unity of the whole, and misses the essential point, that the Lord *does not turn away* from these His enemies, but begins again in His compassion to utter promises to them. Τηρεῖν means generally, to pay respect to His word, hence to perceive and admit its meaning, and give it proper regard: it includes the whole obedience of faith from its first admission to its full confirmation. So we find it in chap. xv. 20, and there we have its best parallel. Ἐάν τις as in chap. vii. 37. *If* (even among you) any man yet sincerely marks My word, lays hold of it, and retains it! For it is very certain and self-understood that λόγον τηρεῖν does not here mean keeping the commandments in act; but the living word of Christ is the seed of divine and eternal life, which being sown is to be kept in the heart until all its fruit is borne. He who bears this within himself will not and cannot in the essential meaning of the word, *die!*[1] Chap. xi. 25, 26, dilates most copiously upon the great thought, and pursues it into its full meaning; *here* for the first time in this Gospel the negation of death as a positive promise of life occurs in a new phraseology, that of not "seeing death;" although chap. v. 24, vi. 50, 51, 58, had most obviously prepared the way for it. In chap. vi. the resurrection stood in connection with the not dying, but the intermediate death of the body was still acknowledged; now, however, the expression is much more strong and absolute —shall not *see death*, that is, not know death at all as such. See Ps. lxxxix. 49, xlix. 10, xvi. 10; Luke ii. 26. Thus this great promise denies the being of death in dying itself;[2] and in proportion as the eye of faith can behold and penetrate this word of Christ, and the soul can hold it fast, believers in Him pass through all the bitterness of bodily death, and all the final anguish of the soul, without any dread of ultimate condemnation, fearing, indeed, no more evil (Ps. xxiii. 4)—and thus "in the act of dying feel not and see not death." Rieger: "As he who walks towards the sun, sees not the shadow behind him."

These Jews, indeed, cannot apprehend all this, for they know

[1] For spiritual and eternal death is essentially such, physical death is only such figuratively. Let ver. 51 show what Jesus thought of in ver. 44.

[2] The emphasis lies upon θάνατος; not upon εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, as it has been explained—mortem in æternitatem, *i.e.*, mortem æternam!

not what θάνατος essentially is. They pretermit the answer as a whole, and take offence at the least paradoxical word of it, instead of pondering the Lord's meaning. Thus they swiftly discover that this word is sufficient proof of the foul charge which *they* had just brought against Him! The νῦν ἐγνώκαμεν, manifestly more than the previous οὐ καλῶς λέγομεν; they seem to admit, half in self-betrayal and half in seeming condescension, some uncertainty in their previous allegation: but now they can maintain—It is clear, at least after this, that we were right; this leaves no more doubt! In bitter stiffneckedness they will adduce to the last *their father* Abraham; and now associate with him for strong proof and confirmation all the prophets too. They, certainly, all kept the sayings *of God*, and are not the less *dead* on that account? Are *Thy* sayings more than those? When they repeat His words, the meaninglessness of which they exhibit, as it were, for His own acknowledgment that He knew not what He was speaking of, they use *tasting* instead of *seeing;* and this, though not a designed *perversion*,[1] yet is, as Lange remarks, a designed *intensification* of the word. They use, in order to signify bodily death, the expression which obviously makes prominent the special bitterness of dying; an expression which does not, indeed, occur in that sense in the Old Testament, but is very frequent in the Rabbinical writings,[2] and was ordinarily used even in the time of Christ to designate death, see Matt. xvi. 28. When they thus limit the word to its exclusive reference to bodily death, they falsify the saying of Christ by misunderstanding it; for the believer may, indeed, in that sense experience the bitterness and sting of death (as the Lord Himself did pre-eminently for us all, Heb. ii. 9)—and yet through this death, which he sees not and knows not as death, pass into higher life. Art Thou greater than our father Abraham? Thus do the Ἰουδαῖοι, whose boast is to know, speak with the same spirit of folly as in ch. iv. 12 the woman of Samaria. The ὅστις, which is certainly genuine, has in its full emphasis the "fuller meaning" which Baumgarten-Crusius would require ὅτι to express. Τίνα σεαυτὸν [σὺ] ποιεῖς is, after

[1] They did not pervert the truth by the change; for he who seeth not death as something frightful, tastes it not as anything bitter. Roos.

[2] Without necessarily requiring any allusion to a cup or goblet.

all that has passed, much keener than the similar formula, ch. i. 22. There it is still questioning, but here it is condemnatory too; comp. ch. v. 18, x. 33, xix. 7.

In vers. 54–56 the answer travels backwards through the objection, just as before. *What makest Thou Thyself?* Answer: I honour not Myself in any such self-assumption (ch. vii. 18, v. 31) as would be indeed an *οὐδέν*, like all lying self-commendation of vain man; but My Father honoureth Me! The same, whom *ye* vainly call your God, and yet know Him not. Vers. 47, 42, 19, ch. vii. 28, 29. *Art Thou greater than Abraham?* The answer does not go at once and prematurely enter into that question, but asserts:—I know God *as My Father*, I hold fast and fulfil the word which He has given Me as My commission.

Finally, *Abraham is dead*—no, I say unto you, Abraham liveth, although he is dead, and knoweth now, in the joy of eternal life, of My manifestation, which once in his lifetime he longed and waited for.

Ver. 54. Δοξάζων με embraces all in one, which had been and still is spoken of. It is also equivalent to δοξάσει, as the ἔστιν, parallel with ver. 50, shows: He will one day assert My honour. But it is here, first of all, as an answer: ἐδόξασέ με, He has bestowed upon Me the honour which in word and deed I must bear witness to and maintain; He has imposed it upon Me as a commission that I, for the sake of His honour in Me, should represent Myself to the world as what I am. This is then the λόγος αὐτοῦ of ver. 55. If ye knew Him, ye would also know and acknowledge Me; but ye *say* only that He is *your* God.[1] Almost all expositors glide rapidly over the most weighty assurance given here, in which Jesus declares *His Father* and the God who revealed Himself in Israel, though by Israel He was not truly known, to be *the same*. He thereby protests, as against all Gnostic distinction between the Demiurgus and the New Testament God, so against all the Rationalist or semi-believing misapprehension of the Old Testament which prevails in our own day. The consequences which are to be deduced from this one saying of Christ extend much further than many are willing to

[1] The response by their ἡμῶν is incorrect. Jesus is very far from taking their lying words into His lips, and retorting them, as they had done with His.

follow them; are such as many show themselves unwilling distinctly to realise. If "God the Father of Jesus Christ" be actually one and the same with "Jehovah, the God-King of Israel" (to use de Wette's words), this gives of itself ample assurance that He could never in old time have essentially otherwise revealed Himself than in after time. We should carefully maintain and keep inviolate the historical and economical distinction between the Old Testament and the Christian, the failure in which has betrayed Zinzendorf, for example, into much confusion: but we should be still more careful that we do not regard the Old Testament as a collection of Jewish books, and deal with them as we deal with the literature of any other people, just as if there were no New Testament to reduce all which God has spoken, to one vast, comprehensive, and connected Revelation. The same God who spake to the fathers before He finally spake in His Son, and in whose progressive revelations no appearance of contradiction can be supposed ever to have been permitted, must have in some degree announced the glorious and perfect future in the preparatory imperfection of every age, and given it more or less to be known. The Christian expositor, therefore, of the Old Testament has not the task imposed upon him to become a Jew again (impossible as that is in itself!), and to reproduce the twilight of intelligence which before the great Fulfilment was all that could visit the souls of men in those ages. His province is to inlay and interweave the great explanation which Christ has given of all that the God of Israel, who is His Father, meant to say from the beginning; thereby becoming himself more and more assured, in this way of faith leading to knowledge, that after all he has not in reality inlaid anything into old Scripture, but only expounded and *opened* their original and true meaning.[1] This is not to abolish the true distinction which subsists, but only to reveal the true unity subsisting in their difference. As there is no *Christ* or Messiah but He of whom the prophetic word bore witness, *even so there is nothing essentially Christian, which could possibly form*

[1] According to Lu. xxiv. 27 and 45, the disciples did indeed understand in the prophetic Scriptures *more* than the writers of these Scriptures were themselves conscious of; but nothing more than what the Spirit of Christ in them had spoken from the beginning.

a pure and perfect contrast with anything actually pertaining to the Old Testament.

And here, finally, the biblical theology of the Old Testament must shake itself free from another inveterate and ruinous evil, that of confounding two distinct things—that which proceeded directly from *God*, the Father of Jesus Christ, and that which, in their half intelligence, their misapprehension, or their entire perversion, *the Hebrew people* constructed out of it. The same sentence of our Lord, in which He declares that this people's God was His Father, imputes also to this people an *οὐκ ἐγνώκατε αὐτόν*—and not referring simply to this present generation, but to their similarly unbelieving fathers. (Acts vii. 51.) Indeed, according to the measure in which faith was wanting, a lack of knowledge was necessarily involved even in the case of the sincere. We know that the people, as the people of a calling and election, were already furnished with all that was needful; but that the people misunderstood and perverted the word of God as well as their own way, is manifest from their own historical and prophetical archives, which exhibit as a whole that great conflict between the Holy One of Israel and His called ones, which at length at the manifestation of Christ reached its fearful climax. Even as that "Christendom" which has been gradually formed among the nations and through the ages, with all its dogmas and ecclesiastical constitutions, is far from exhibiting in its purity all that was given unto man in Christ; so still less must we think to find in the so-called "Hebraismus" or the "predominant faith" of this people, the *λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ* which were intrusted to their unfaithfulness. (Rom. iii. 2, 3.) This is undeniable, as it respects that supreme crisis when Pharisaism, called orthodox but perverting the essence of the Old Testament, crucified the Messiah; and why may not the same fundamental distinction be applied to all these ages!

Thus indeed most assuredly "the idea of the Supreme God, the Creator of heaven and earth, was limited and restricted by the popular notion of the national God of the Israelites."[1] But the Lord condemns as a lie the false element of particularism in this, when He says—*λέγετε ὅτι θεὸς ὑμῶν ἐστι*; the truth in it,

[1] De Wette erbaul. Erklär. der Psalmen, S. 15. Only not in the holy books themselves, in as far as and where they contain the *λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ*!

as connected with God's special covenant, He in the same words confirms. He does not protest against the θεὸς ὑμῶν unconditionally, but against their λέγειν. He might have said—He is indeed *your* God as I am *your* Christ, only not in the sense in which ye appropriate, without understanding the word. Yea more! This misapprehension in its *lesser degree*, and not having lost the reality of fellowship with God, was foreseen in man's weakness and in its time borne with, by God Himself; just as Christ endured the Jewish limitation of His Apostles' notions of the Messiah, until the final opening of their understandings. But the full intelligence of Scripture came to them through the Risen Saviour and His Holy Spirit; and it perfectly harmonises with the words which He spake unto them while He was yet with them. (Lu. xxiv. 44–47.) The God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob (as He is soon termed at the outset of the apostolical history) is not, because He entered into the fellowship of election and covenant with these holy patriarchs, therefore the isolated God of these men and their seed after the flesh; Abraham rather understood Him aright as the Judge of all the earth (Gen. xviii. 25), and knew that the goal of the special covenant was the salvation and blessing of all the families of the earth. Again, the peculiar relation of the people of the covenant to the same God who is also the Father of Jesus Christ, is far from being abolished in the New Testament (see Acts iii. 25, 26); yea, rather, *His* own prediction confirms it even to the end of the days, and gives us to expect in the great futurity the full development of both covenants in one, the new covenant returning back again into that which was of eternal validity in the old. The Lord utters it as an ὀξύμωρον, containing both a severe reproach and a meek lamentation:—Ye know not *your God*, and your λέγειν concerning Him perverts the unknown truth into a lie; ye know not how graciously this God of your fathers declares Himself through Me and My work, as your, and your children's God!

It is, more particularly, not merely the moral substance of the law, as coinciding with the natural law in the conscience, which is the indispensable foundation of the Gospel's forgiveness and salvation from sin, but the testimony concerning the guilt and ruin of the natural man before this holy Law. The history of

the *Fall* at the beginning of Scripture (to which, therefore, ver. 44 in our ch. necessarily pointed), the progressive factual confirmation of which the history of Israel, by the prophetic Spirit[1] of God was intended, when viewed aright, to exhibit; then the *Law* itself condemning this sin, in connection with its propitiatory economy which brought no propitiation (Heb. x. 2–4); thus the *revelation of sin and death* pervading the whole Old Testament is the most essential *preparation* for the Redemption;—so that the Lord's saying in ver. 51 must necessarily be hailed by every true Israelite with the joy of Abraham or Simeon (comp. also Lu. i. 79), as the *coming time*. From the Book of Job to Malachi—the *fall* and *redemption*, *nature* and *grace*, are the true great fundamental truths which the ancient Scriptures everywhere presuppose and announce. Their practical misapprehension was the reason that the Jews did not know and understand Christ; the same, at least in a lower degree, is the cause of much exegetical obtuseness concerning the unity of the Old and New Testaments—as will be seen presently in ver. 56.

Ver. 55. The conscious knowledge of God which Jesus predicates of Himself, and which did not come, or was not taught to Him as to us from without, but sprung from His essential unity of nature with the Father, is expressed in this οἶδα as far transcending the sense of any ἐγνώκατε. This He *must* testify, because He bears witness to the truth, and is the truth. I *cannot* say οὐκ οἶδα—let it not be taken wrong that I avow Myself before you to be what I am! Thus almost in tones of entreaty He asserts Himself; yet it is impossible but that this pure truth should at the same time condemn these *liars*.—I cannot, because I am not, and can never be, *what ye are!* Ὅμοιος ὑμῖν may be more verbally correct than ὑμῶν; yet the former and better authenticated word might be designed to give that specific emphasis which Bengel seizes;—then should I be *of your kind*, that is, a liar. (Even de Wette—like you, a liar.) But ye are liars in that ye now and generally speak of God as being your God for your father Abraham's sake, while ye know Him not as Abraham knew Him. Olshausen finds a difficulty, too favourable to Socinianism, in our Lord's saying of Himself—τὸν λόγον

[1] By means of the historical writers of the Bible, as נְבִיאִים רִאשׁוֹנִים.

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA.

τοῦ θεοῦ τηρῶ; but we discern in it, on the one hand, the *human* fidelity of obedience of the Son of man who exists in and with the Son of God, the profound truth of which only the old one-sided theology misapprehended; and, on the other, we have shown already that this *λόγον τηρῶ* signifies in its most obvious connection the fulfilment of His commission to bear this testimony. (Comp. the *ἐντολή*, to give up His life also, chap. x. 18, xiv. 31, with the *ἐντολή, τί εἴπω καὶ τί λαλήσω*, chap. xii. 49.) It is His severe task, but His bounden duty, to fulfil this commission faithfully, even in contest with such contradicters as these! Thus in the use of such expression the Lord condescends to *our level* in *ἀλήθεια*, though not in the *ψεῦδος* (hence in chap. xv. 10—*καθὼς ἐγὼ τὰς ἐντολὰς τοῦ πατρός μου τετήρηκα*); but Bengel's fine distinction must not be forgotten, that while *we* must *first* receive and retain the word, in order to come to the perfect knowledge of it (vers. 31, 32)—He places His *οἶδα* before the *τηρῶ*.

And here we may pause for a moment to consider the *practical* teaching of this whole colloquy, as it is a symbolical pattern for our Lord's servants' disputing witness in all ages:—As the Gospel for the Judica me Deus Sunday in Passion time, it furnishes an inexhaustible text. Suffer thyself to be reviled! If the charge have any ground of truth in *thee*, who art not without sin, aggravate not thy sin by reviling again, by denying the truth in the slightest degree before God, or by permitting thy love to fail before another's wrath. Seek not *thine own* honour; else may thy God seek out thy disgrace and judge thee as thou deservest. But, on the other hand, sin not by denial of the truth which thou knowest before God. Recede in everything which concerns thine own person, but in nothing which affects thy God. Keep silence, instead of justifying thyself, in every case in which absolutely no more is involved than—thine own honour.[1] But where the truth is concerned, and the bearing

[1] As Melancthon took until the next morning for reflection, in his disputation with Dr Eck. The latter taunted him—This is not to your honour, Philip! When Philip replied—We have not to do with our own honour, but with the Lord's. (Comp. Matthesius, die 12 Pred. v. Luth. Leben.) Great word! Would that it were written in letters of gold over the professorial chairs in many of our academical halls.

testimony against the liars for their own salvation, let not thy mouth be stopped, and let not thine heart be led astray: speak out until they take up stones, with the same meekness and firmness combined as thy Lord's! A high art is this! and a most pressing duty! A task committed to us, as to Him, as our business in the world; but which only by His Spirit within us we can perform!

Ver. 56. If we have not been altogether mistaken in our observation upon the distinctly and pervasively negative tone in the three answers to the three objections (here as in ver. 49), it will now shed light upon this obscure verse, and determine thus much at least—that it contains a *protestation against the assumption that Abraham was dead.* But because in the ordinary meaning of the word to which the Jews clung, he was incontrovertibly dead, we must have recourse to the supposition that our Lord would set the true meaning of His promise uttered ver. 51, in the strongest light, by an assurance which apparently expresses the general paradox, but in reality solves it:—"Abraham lives yet, though he is dead! He so lives in the enjoyment of the reward of faith, that he is not properly speaking dead, and *that* is My meaning!" Further, because the objection of the Jews had also improperly opposed Abraham and the prophets as living and dying without Jesus, to those who were in after time to become immortal through *His* (not God's) words—it is the design of our Lord, whose answers are still precisely pertinent to the questions they reply to, to show that Abraham's faith while he lived, and its reward after he died, had direct reference to *Himself* as the Expected of the fathers. Thus much, it seems to me, we may assume a priori (if the expositor may use such a word), from the connection and consistent sense of the whole, for the meaning of the following retrospective saying, even before we have read it. If anything could disturb my clear conviction, it would be the mere historical fact that most expositors both in the older and the later church have failed to take this view. And are the words themselves so very obscure? Assuredly not, they are the simplest and most common expressions:—rejoicing in the thought of seeing what when seen gives yet greater joy (the contrast being very express), on the one side; and *the day of Christ* on the other, which no one familiar

with the Scriptural and Jewish phraseology can hesitate to interpret aright. What causes then the obscurity, in which so much expository vision has seen erroneously? We cannot but think that the παρερμηνεύειν in this passage is simply the result of the general assumption that the thing itself is *not to be believed!* There are many who address themselves to its exposition with the foregone conclusion that to make the passage teach Abraham's experience of Christ's life after his death, is too bold a theory to be tolerated: and *in consequence* they interpret it otherwise. This is the first and most obvious meaning of the words; and those who deny it must do so under the influence, more or less unconscious, of that assumption.

Even Abraham,—*your father*, as ye call him again and again, and as I in the beginning (ver. 37) admitted him, and still admit him to be, in respect to your derivation after the flesh—bears witness for Me, whom he waited for, and in whom he rejoiced; but against you, who in that respect are altogether unlike him, who neither understand aright the hope of his lively faith, nor know concerning him what he is and enjoys now that he is "dead."[1] In *My* day he rejoiced by anticipation, that he should see it—this cannot possibly indicate anything but the manifestation of Christ in the flesh. When afterwards in the New Testament the day of Christ refers to the reversionary hope of His second coming, the distinction is made perfectly clear; but here, where we are carried back to Abraham's time, and the day of Christ is made the goal of a hope which afterwards had its fulfilment, it *must* necessarily mean that which the Jews generally designated as יְמוֹת מָשִׁיחַ in the most comprehensive sense, and especially, of course, the then present days of His life in the flesh. So in Lu. xvii. 26 we had the days of the Son of man in connection with the ἡμέραις Νῶε; and previously, ver. 22, μίαν τῶν ἡμερῶν manifestly referring to His first manifestation in the flesh vainly wished back again. (See on this our

[1] The second, and not merely practical reference (intimating to the opponents how little they resembled *their father*) which Chrysostom observed upon, is not, as Lücke thinks, too far-fetched, but enters into the spirit of the whole colloquy. But we should hesitate to agree with Klee that a contrast is hinted between Abraham's joy and their endeavour to *extinguish* His day.

exposition.) Thus does the Lord immediately after this discourse, and echoing its thoughts, explain Himself in ch. ix. 4, 5, where He says: As long as I am in the world as Light, it is day; soon will the night come. And this is very significant, as it adds to the profound and comprehensive discourse as a whole, the new thought that the time of Christ is the longed for time of *Light*, the consummation of all the prophecy and promise of the preliminary starshining and twilight: (comp. 2 Pet. i. 19). *Therefore* it is called here *the day* and not the days.[1] Further, the recent expositor Lange is perfectly right when he bids us distinguish, as in perfect contrast, the joyful hope and expectation of Abraham resting upon the promise that he should see the day of Christ, from the seeing itself.[2] Similarly Ebrard: "The Old Testament gives us no such contrast in the life of Abraham as that between the waiting for the day of Christ, and the actually seeing it." Such a specific crisis of vision as might be reckoned to be a fulfilment of his desire, and as distinguished from that desire, must, if the Lord were here speaking of a matter of history, have been on record, so that the Lord might appeal to it as something well known. If ἰδεῖν is compared with the θεωρήσῃ of ver. 51, it still can be no other than an actual living in and experiencing; the καὶ εἶδε, however, must be unconditionally taken in the same sense as the ἵνα ἴδῃ.[3] If we compare Matt. xiii. 17, and Lu. x. 24, which form a very important parallel, we find that the true *seeing*, which brings with it joy, can have place only in the very days of Christ. There as here the Lord witnesses the truth, so decisive for the

[1] Hence also it is clear that it is not just the *birth* of Christ which is referred to, as Ebrard and Lange think.

[2] But we cannot see why Abraham as the father of the Jews should be distinguished, in contrast, from Abraham as the Seer of the day of Christ; the unity of the one Abraham lies at the foundation of the whole discourse!

[3] We must not introduce into this ἠγαλλιάσατο, by a pregnant construction, any idea of *wishing* (as Grotius too confidently expounds the מְסַבֵּחַ); the main point is a confident waiting for, which by anticipation rejoices; as Nonnus simply gives it—ἰδεῖν ἠγάλλετο θυμῷ. The ἵνα does not stand instead of ὅτι, for the object of the joy, but defines this to be in the assured and promised future:—He rejoiced in this, *that he should see.* Lampe: quod visurus esset. Comp. chap. i. 8.

unity of the Old and New Testaments, that all the faithful of former times hoped in *Him*, and waited for *Him;* even as, according to 1 Pet. i. 10–12 did the collective *prophets*, whom the Lord does not now include, in order that He may the more definitely single out their father Abraham. We have here the evidence that the Lord attributes to Abraham (like the Epistle to the Hebrews, and even yet more plainly) a profound understanding of the Messianic aim of all the promises given to himself.[1]

And now Abraham hath actually *seen*, with greater χαίρειν, that day of Christ, the expectation of which itself had been to him an ἀγαλλιᾶσθαι! This cannot, according to the reasons which we have already assigned, have been a vision which took place in Abraham's own lifetime, and not in the time of Christ. The acute Schleiermacher assures his hearers that the Lord here spoke of nothing more than what took place in Abraham's own time, and of nothing more than the promise which was given to him; after which promise he rejoiced that he *should see* My day. But this most incomprehensibly omits the following words —*And he saw it!* Equally inexplicable is Kurtz' rigid adherence to the solution by Abraham's theophanies. No, the Lord does not mean—if we may mention the leading errors of exposition—the manifestation of the Son of God among the three guests at Mamre,[2] nor the birth of Isaac at which Abraham laughed,[3] nor Isaac's restoration from death, Heb. xi. 19.[4] Nor is the view correct which predominated in a later age, and which understands it of a *spiritual prospective view* of the day of Christ (the πόρρωθεν ἰδόντες καὶ ἀσπασάμενοι, Heb. xi. 13)—

[1] In connection with which we need not have recourse to the Jewish notion that God had specially revealed to Abraham the entire futurity of all his seed; and especially the Messianic times. Still less are we (with Baumgarten-Crusius) to include "the idea, that the old fathers referred the Messianic expectation to their own times!"

[2] Gen. xviii. 10 being then emphasized—I will return unto thee; and explained of a mysterious visit accompanying Isaac's birth, as a pledge of His future incarnation! So Moldenhawer, but also the Hirschb. Bible, and Hess in the Leben Jesu.

[3] So *e.g.* Ernesti; and also the Berlenb. Bible!

[4] So Grotius, with many of the fathers. Euthymius says most arbitrarily —ἡμέραν αὐτοῦ λέγει τὴν τοῦ σταυροῦ.

even specifically, with some, the *great* day of revelation in judgment. Lange's position is incontrovertible, that all prospective vision, all prophetic vision (even Roos' "extasy not recorded by Moses"), must be contained in the first clause. Yet Origen, Augustin, Chrysostom, Theophylact, Erasmus, Luther, Calvin, Beza, and so forth, maintained this interpretation, which has become the common tradition. Even Bengel went so far astray as to apply it to the anticipation of the day of the Lord's glory.[1] Olshausen lays much stress upon the connection with ver. 58, from which it would necessarily follow that the Lord spoke of a seeing in the lifetime of Abraham. But, however specious this sounds, it is much more important that it disturbs the more necessary connection of the previous sayings of Christ, according to which Christ would establish the fact of Abraham's not being dead. The connection on the other hand with ver. 58 is not so very strict, since the new, and bitter, and blind objection of the Jews has intervened; and the Lord now places His eternal and Divine nature in opposition to this, as we shall see. Suffice that it is altogether inadmissible to place the καὶ εἶδε in Abraham's life upon earth.[2]

The only sound interpretation we most positively assert to be, that the day of Christ is, as Cyrill. declared, ὁ τῆς ἐπιδημίας αὐτοῦ καιρός; and thus that Abraham's seeing that day in his

[1] Diem *majestatis* Christi, qui dies omnia Christi tempora, etiam in oculis Abrahæ, præsupponit. *Alii sunt* dies carnis Christi, alius Dies Christi ipsius et gloriæ ejus. Vidit diem Christi, qui in semine, quod *stellarum* instar futurum erat, sidus maximum est et fulgentissimum. Et *quia* hunc diem plane vitalem vidit, mortem non vidit. *Sic* Judæorum instantia retunditur. (?) *Non* tamen vidit ut Apostoli, Matt. xiii. 17. This strange interpretation is reproduced in an English Irvingite work, with special reference to the restoration of Israel.

[2] Not, finally, as Baumgarten-Crusius resolves it. He first makes a very proper remark as to what must have been involved ("thus I *quickened* Him,—this being in the connection, that the patriarch himself had received life from Him")—but then weakens this down to a figurative life, the refreshment of his soul in the midst of the longing ungratified expectation. And with all such Rationalism as this must fall the mystical interpretation of a joyful "birthday of Christ *in the heart*"—see in the otherwise beautiful little book of G. H. Schuberth, die Wiederkunft des Herrn, Petersburg 1820, S. 222. Thus does faith graze the limits of infidelity.

living condition must be placed after his death. This was first[1] clearly and definitely stated by the Jesuit Maldonatus: Cum dicit *vidit*, haud dubium, quin eo modo vidisse dicat, quo videre dixerat tantopere concupivisse. Non autem concupiverat solâ videre fide, — — quia fide jam Christi diem videbat. Vidit ergo diem Christi *re ipsâ*, quem ad modum et ille et patres omnes videre concupierant. Quis enim dubitet Abraham et cæteros patres, qui cum eo erant (sive ex revelatione, quam in hac vitâ habuissent, sive ex revelatione, quam tunc, quum Christus venit, habuerint de ejus adventu) *non ignorasse Christum venisse*, etiam antequam ad eos post mortem veniret. In favour of this declare themselves Lampe, Mosheim, Kuinoel, Tholuck, Lücke, de Wette, Meier, von Gerlach, Lange. And it may be hoped that this will always be accepted now as the simple and straightforward interpretation of these plain words: for even the Socinian distortion (which Tittmann accepts)—Abraham *would have rejoiced*, had he survived to My time!—rests upon an admission of the direct and inevitable meaning of *ἰδεῖν τὴν ἡμέραν*. Moses and Elias at the Transfiguration teach us that for the fathers in blessedness, but waiting in blessedness, even *intercourse* with Christ manifest upon earth was possible and actual, especially in the case of those who occupied a theocratic and prophetically significant relation to Him. And may not this hold good of *Abraham*, so far as that the *εἶδε καὶ ἐχάρη* shall be accepted from the Lord's lips as an actual truth, just as the words run? Yea, we are disposed to regard the mere *ex revelatione non ignorare* (which we have placed in a parenthesis in the quotation from Maldonatus) as saying too little; and would prefer to understand an actual intercourse, though secret, between Abraham and Christ. For although we must decline any deeper penetration into this hinted mystery, yet we cannot but say that the past tense seems to us to refer to some special historical period, which as such was already past. In any case the Lord gives a sublime assurance that He was privy to the actual joy of Abraham at His manifestation in the flesh, as the object for which he had while in the flesh waited with the joy of hope.

[1] That is among those known to us. Certainly this view has not been altogether wanting in the church of any age.

What a word for these Jews! They understood it, as we see, so far at least, that this Jesus standing before them brings His own day into immediate conjunction with Abraham. To them it evidently and convincingly said—*If* the Messiah is come, certainly father Abraham will know, and have some experience of it. And as this was so plain to them, the *confidence* with which Jesus announced it would have been evidence enough, if they had been disposed to hear and to feel. But *now* (though not in ver. 52, concerning the tasting of death) they maliciously, whether consciously or unconsciously, pervert His words in order to make them appear absurd. Abraham hath seen Me—Thou hast seen Abraham! These two things are very distinct, since in the former Abraham's continuance till the days of the Son of man is alone presupposed (which they believed, but had altogether lost sight of in their reference to death); but in the latter Jesus, and, as they regard Him, a mere *man*, must have already lived in the time of Abraham! B.-Crusius discerns here a second perversion; as the Lord had not said that Abraham had seen Him, but *His day*. Quite right, but the question still arises, whether the Lord, who would not speak too plainly of these secret things, might not have intimated in those words the actual seeing of Himself. In such things there is often much more, and more wonderful mystery, involved than obviously appears in the words: of this we have a symbolical example here, for the Jews in their misapprehension pervert the Lord's words into what they think an absurdity, viz., that Jesus would make Himself to have seen Abraham—and this is after all strictly correct! For though not this man Jesus, yet this I in Him, was, according to His higher Personality now united with humanity, before Abraham, because before all creatures! They measure His time by the half-century not expired—and He is the eternal I Am![1]

[1] Grotius: certe nondum semisæcularis es. This seems most simple, eighteen centuries being between Him and Abraham. It is not necessary to resort to any proverbial reference to the year of Jubilee, or the time when the period of actual Levitical service ceased. We need not think of any premature old age, or any marred appearance (as Clem. Alex. comp. Vavasor de formâ Christi); of any misunderstanding of the Jews who inferred, either from His πολυπειρία (Euthymius) or from the

Ver. 58. What the Prologue had declared, ch. i. 1, 2, is here asserted as the testimony of the Lord Himself. Dorner remarks that the critical idea of His *pre-existence*, which St John, in harmony with St Paul, places in the forefront of his Gospel, in contradistinction from the Synoptics, is nevertheless not altogether wanting in the Synoptics themselves; and he is quite correct. To the passages which he adduces (Matt. xi. 19; Luke ix. 49, Wisdom—Matt. xi. 27, the Son who alone knoweth the Father), we take liberty to add Luke x. 18 and Matt. xxiii. 37, according to our exposition of it,—without mentioning many other consequential inferences elsewhere to be deduced.

It remains nevertheless true, that only in St John are to be found the literal, and plain, and express testimonies of Jesus Himself concerning His existence before men, and before the created world. This passage, ch. vi. 62, and ch. xvii. 5, are the three great texts, which only wilful and blind sophistry can pervert. The Socinians (like the ancient heretics, qui hominem dicebant Jesum præcognitum et prædestinatum, qui ante adventum carnalem substantialiter et proprie non extiterit) have made the being before Abraham a quasi-existence in the Divine appointment and predetermination;[1] and many not bearing that name resort to the same refuge, though sometimes idealistically disguised:[2] but with such people there can be no exegetical contest, and we can only point to the ἐγώ, which, connected with the εἰμί, cannot signify any decree or counsel concerning this I, but just this personal ἐγώ Himself, about whom the

solemnity of His spiritual devotion, that His age was greater. The conclusion to which Irenæus comes is historically remarkable—that Jesus was actually above forty years old; and the ancient reading, forty instead of fifty, evidently leaned that way.

[1] If not actually with Socinus: Before Abraham became *Abraham*, that is, the father of the people!!

[2] B.-Crusius, comparing Rev. xiii. 8; 1 Pet. i. 20,—thought of and decreed, that is, essentially and virtually I was already in being! De Wette: pre-existence, but of course only in an ideal sense! Schleiermacher: Before Abraham lived, I was He upon whom all truth was based, to whom every glimmering of hope had reference; from the beginning have I been the centre of all Divine promises!

Jews were speaking, in the identity of His personal self-consciousness. Πρὶν Ἀβραὰμ γενέσθαι does not mean antequam *esset* (for which Grot. refers to ver. 33, ch. xx. 27, i. 6, 30; Acts vii. 38, xiii. 5 and elsewhere)—but antequam *nasceretur*, as Erasmus has it. (Comp. Nonnus, πρὶν γένος ἔσχεν.) Most assuredly, as de Wette admits (who rejects the idea of being born or *becoming* in any sense), the γενέσθαι in this brief and pointed discourse forms a contrast, as a being introduced into time, with εἶναι—a contrast which Bengel finds most undeniably in such passages as Mark iv. 22; Acts xxvi. 29; 1 Cor. iii. 18. And the Syr. translates in the future—עדלא נהוה אברהם. For Christ now goes altogether beyond His former words; the ignorance and the wilfulness of their objections admit of no explanation; the gulf between Him and them has become too great for any conciliation; and the Lord therefore overwhelms all their contradiction by a conclusive word, which is not so much a continuation of the preceding argument, as a sudden flash of revelation from the depths of *His own eternal consciousness*. That He should have finally spoken thus is not to be wondered at, on the supposition of this eternal consciousness abiding ever with Him: rather is it wonderful that He should have ordinarily and as His rule restrained it so much. Thus here, too, He restrains Himself; and does not go on to say, as afterwards in the prayer to His Father—πρὸ τοῦ τὸν κόσμον εἶναι; though this πρὶν γενέσθαι, in antithesis with His own εἰμὶ, could mean no less than this, comp. Ps. xc. 1, 2; Isa. xliii. 13. To degrade this εἰμί into a Present used for an Imperfect,[1] is altogether inapplicable, especially in connection with the γενέσθαι. Consequently, we must adhere to it that the Lord asserts of His own I, the same whose higher nature He had indicated to them before in ver. 25 as going forth in the λαλεῖν, a timeless *being* before the becoming, or coming into existence, of Abraham, and not only so, but as a necessary consequence of its universality of expression, *before all created being*. Thus He testifies of Himself, as His Spirit afterwards speaks by Paul, Col. i. 15–17, who terms Him the πρωτότοκος πάσης

[1] To which Grotius bends the ἐγὼ πέλον of Nonnus; but the Syr. to which he refers has the verb substantive אִיתַי quite plainly.

κτίσεως, καὶ αὐτός ἐστι πρὸ πάντων.[1] He distinguishes His γεννηθῆναι (of which ch. v. 26 gave testimony) most rigorously from γεγονέναι; and utterly rejects every ἦν ὅτε οὐκ ἤμην, His Being going back into the Divine eternity. This ἐγώ εἰμι incontrovertibly includes in itself the Divine אֲנִי הוּא; in the sacred idiom this essentially present Being as opposed to becoming, could not be otherwise expressed than by the אֶהְיֶה or אֶהְיֶה אֲשֶׁר אֶהְיֶה which is the name of the self-revealing God in Ex. iii. 14. This gives the μείζων τοῦ Ἀβραάμ, from which ver. 53 the discourse proceeded, but which is now in sublime dignity omitted, its most appropriate and transcendently sufficient answer.[2]

As, according to ver. 56, His appearance in the flesh appears to be the longed for goal of all Old-Testament promise; so now His eternal Divinity in a definite ἡμέρᾳ incarnate, appears as the original fount of all revelation and creation. Learn from this the relation and the unity of the Old and New Testaments! And learn from this how to adjust and understand aright the saying of Lactantius, which, although connected in him with an imperfect Christology (see Dorner S. 785), is not in itself heretical, scarcely (as Cellarius thinks) dangerous:—Christus docuit quod unus Deus sit, eumque solum coli oportere, *nec unquam se ipse Deum dixit:* quia non servasset fidem, si missus, ut Deos tolleret, et *unum* adsereret, *induceret alium, præter unum.* (Institt. 4, 14.) For He assuredly could not announce Himself to be a *distinctive, second*[3] God, and therefore, as He stood before men uttering the specific ἐγώ of the eternal Son, He could not directly say—ἐγώ θεός εἰμι. And this *not merely* because it would be necessarily exposed to a blasphemous misapprehension, but because it would be in itself no more right than to say—ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ πατήρ. On the other hand, I and My Father are one—bespeaks the true *Divinity* of Jesus Christ, and it is this which He everywhere avows; so that according to ch. xvii. 3, the Father as αὐτόθεος may be called ὁ μόνος ἀληθινὸς θεός, although in a very different

[1] In the Pastor of Hermas, Simil 9, 12, antiquior omni creatura.

[2] Whereof Grotius now says rightly—quod ipse innuere quam prædicare mavult.

[3] The phrase of the schools—δεύτερος θεός—is an altogether unsuitable and dangerous one.

sense from the heretical μονώτατος of Arianism. This gives rise to no tritheist error, nor is the honour of the Father thus invaded by the Son, who is God only from and in and with Him—nor does it contradict the truth that the Son was nevertheless before the world κατ' ἰδίαν οὐσίας περιγραφὴν with the Father. The apology "contra eos, qui dicunt Christum nunquam se in Evangelis aperte Deum dixisse" (on which Peter of Clugny wrote, see Neander's Bernard S. 186) requires to be very carefully handled, lest the truth underlying the error should be denied.

But instead of *worship* follows—*stoning*. Such was the issue of all the Lord's sayings, after they had reached this climax! Not because He abased their father Abraham, as many think (how did He? by the γενέσθαι?), but because they rightly understand the arrogation of Divinity, and the assumed βλασφημία (chap. x. 33) of His words. Where did they at once obtain these stones? An idle and petty question this, which, however, as it has been put, may be answered out of Joseph. Ant. xx. 8, where the building of the temple is recorded as going on in the time of Christ, and Ant. xvii. 9, where an instance of stoning in the temple is narrated. Stones with which the visible temple was being built are to be cast at the corner stone of the Old and New Covenant! To understand in the αἴρειν a going to fetch them, disturbs the whole aspect of the sudden crisis, especially in connection with the ἐκρύβη which is its immediate result.[1] Jesus *hid Himself*, and this is to be regarded as similar at least to Luke iv. 30. We are not to take ἐκρύβη as adverbial in conjunction with καὶ ἐξῆλθεν, as Glassius does, making it *occulto exiit;* it has itself the strong emphasis, and means in relation to the pressing eagerness of these His assaulting enemies, much more than the ἐξένευσεν of chap. v. 13 (although it at the same time allusively anticipates the meaning of chap. xii. 36—"He had now spoken enough, and therefore withdrew or hid Himself from them!"). To interpolate, instead of the conclu-

[1] Out of this Teschendorff constructs a marvellous scene. "They at once ran to fetch stones. And in the midst of this confused tumult, when every one was blindly shouting, pushing, and running hither and thither, it was easy enough for Jesus to escape unperceived. So that when they came with the stones, the victim of them had vanished!" This is certainly making the most of the simple ἦραν οὖν.

sive καὶ ἐξῆλθεν—"And then when the tumult had passed away—presently afterwards," is a total violation of St John's style; and hence Winer himself prefers to allow that the Evangelist records a miraculous ἀφανισμός. But the וַיַּסְתִּירֵם יְהוֹה of Jer. xxxvi. 26, may after the sublime word of ver. 58 be attributed to Jesus *Himself*.

To translate with Hezel—"He *sought* to hide Himself"—must be repulsive to every mind which has, as Winer says, "a sense of the character of the *Gospel*." Lücke regards His "safety as having been effected in a natural way by the prudence of Jesus," and makes Him to have sought concealment "in a house favourably disposed;"[1] and Lange suggests that "the faithful were probably on the spot and encompassed Him about"—but we must take liberty to say that while such an external procedure is not to be utterly denied as impossible, it seems to us altogether needless to suppose it. For St John certainly makes no mention of it, does not distinguish thus between the miraculous and the natural, but refers His "safety" altogether to the ἐκρύβη as the result of the putting forth of the Divine power of Jesus.

Is the additional clause, omitted by Griesbach, Lachmann, and Tischendorff, genuine or not? It may have been taken up from Lu. iv. 30, and the παρῆγεν may have been derived from the immediately following παράγων of ch. ix. 1. It is significant, however, that the Peschito translates in full—וַעֲבַר בֵּינוֹתְהוֹן וְאָזַל. For ourselves we would retain the latter part of it with Bengel, who vindicates καὶ παρῆγεν οὕτως because the καὶ παράγων presupposes it as being a mere repetition; because the similar καὶ in both cases explains the omission of the former; and, finally, because without it the whole chapter too abruptly closes, while the οὕτως has in it a special concluding emphasis.[2] On the other hand the literal similarity of διελθὼν διὰ μέσου with St Luke, is suspicious; he who added it was anxious to

[1] And hence it is accounted for that St John omits to add his usual οὔπω ἐληλύθει ἡ ὥρα αὐτοῦ.

[2] Lampe well explains it: Id ergo vult Evangelista, Jesum (1) non instar fugientis præcipitasse gradum, sed placide deambulando ex templo descendisse—(2) illum Judæos tanquam incurabiles malitiæ suæ reliquisse.

provide against any misunderstanding of the concealment, but the Evangelist's παρῆγεν does this quite sufficiently.

After their first astonishment, the Pharisees (as Teschendorff on this occasion well enlarges) might boast of their perfect victory, and pride themselves on having driven Him from the field —not indeed with their *stones* but with their arguments! In spite of their own consciences they might mockingly cry—He had many things to say of us, but at last He could only fly! He left their blinded pride in possession of this seeming victory. This was the beginning of His submission to His reproach and His cross; but it was likewise the beginning of their deserved judgment, of His devotement of *them* to their doom.

THE MAN BORN BLIND. ANSWER ON THE CAUSE OF THE EVIL. WORKING BEFORE THE NIGHT COMETH. THE POOL OF SILOAM. HIS MANIFESTATION AS THE SON OF GOD.

(Chap. ix. 3–7, 35–37.)

St John gives us now in his Gospel *the last public and great testimony* of Jesus concerning His own Person and salvation; that is, in the more restricted sense which suits this Evangelist's plan. Although the Lord continues down to the end to testify of Himself by work and word; although He exhibits Himself at the grave of Lazarus, before many Jews in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem, as the resurrection and the life; makes His public entry in the midst of hosannas, and utters, in the hearing of the people, His final words to the Greeks, to ch. xii. 37—yet all this is of a very different character from that of the great colloquies and discourses which end with the tenth chapter. Let the reader compare them and judge for himself! And all that which the Synoptics record of the period after the Feast of Tabernacles and the Dedication, and especially of the final week, from the first prediction of His passion, Matt. xvi. 20, 21, down to the woes denounced upon the Pharisees, has an altogether different stamp, being uttered to the disciples and individual men, or in answers to public questionings, being partly in parables, and partly at the close in explicit and open reproofs.

But His testimony and proclamation, as it were *ex professo* that He was the Life-giver, the Giver of blessedness, *the Son*, in whom is the Father and who is in the Father—comes to an end with the tenth chapter, and therefore ch. x. 38 indicates a great preliminary *conclusion*.

All that chs. ix. and x. contain, down to this conclusion, forms but one section and connection. The Lord bears witness to Himself:—in relation to the now sufficiently illustrated *influence* of His coming, as the Light, through which the blind are made to see, and those who see are made blind; in relation to the design of His love, not willing this latter, as the Good *Shepherd* who knoweth His sheep which hear His voice, and layeth down His life for *all;* finally, in relation to His *Personal Nature* as such, as *One with the Father*. What He had spoken after the Feast of Tabernacles, and at the Dedication, John connects closely together, even as the Lord Himself had done. All these discourses have for their historical occasion and starting-point the miracle performed on the man born blind, to whom He reveals Himself as the *Son of God*, the self-evidencing and yet rejected Light that hath come into the world.

It was certainly not upon a following day, but immediately on His way from the temple after ch. viii. 59, that the Lord saw the man born blind. For even if the previous παρῆγεν is not genuine, the καὶ παράγων, ch. ix. 1, must in *St John* connect itself with what immediately precedes; it might have been in the Synoptics a general and indefinite initial formula.[1] The man sate as a beggar, according to ver. 8; and therefore very probably not very far from the temple, as the manner was. It was natural enough that *the disciples* should presently gather around the Lord after the tumultuous breaking up: but it excites objection in the minds of many that the feeling and tone of mind which must be supposed in Jesus and the disciples on this occasion, is out of keeping with what is immediately recorded. But we are not to suppose that our Lord was in any kind of excitement; and it is most obviously improper to regard Him as in haste to make His escape. He had not been provoked or

[1] Even de Wette, who objects to the same day, because Jesus is here too *calm* (after the flight!), is obliged to confess that μετὰ ταῦτα is wanting.

embittered, though deeply grieved; nor had He lost for a moment the profound and unbroken repose which is conspicuous throughout the previous chapter. His departure, therefore, was not flight; but a withdrawal from the aggression of the people, before the hour of God's counsel was fully come. Why should we suppose Him ever indisposed or rendered incapable of looking in kindness upon the poor and the miserable, among whom He finds His way? And would He pass by one who might by His mercy be more readily won than those hardened enemies from whom He turned away? It is from the Lord's *seeing* the unhappy man, that is, from His lingering, sympathising regards fixed upon him, that the whole narrative takes its rise.[1] At this point the disciples ask their question, and the objection seems more specious when applied to them; for it may be thought that the interest here exhibited in the profound problem of the relation between sin and suffering, is inconsistent with the state of mind in which they would leave the excited scene. Yes, if we take the question in its isolated form as here given; but might not such a question as this have been prepared for long before in their thoughts? And now when a critical case presents itself, and they see their Master calmly and sympathisingly contemplating it, as if nothing ungentle had transpired, it appears to us rather *significant* and natural, that they should share His tranquillity, and direct to Him the question which we read.[2] Moreover, we are not to suppose that our record contains absolutely all, and that these words passed with such rapidity; questions like this were generally prepared for by observations within their own circle. Pfenninger has imagined the development of the inquiry thus. Judas began—His parents must have heavily sinned; Thomas replied—Or God foresaw great sin *in him;* John adds—I know not what to think thereon; Peter finally breaks out—Master, tell us who—? This is poetry and not

[1] We may compare this gracious looking upon the blind beggar now, after the scenes of ch. viii., with His beholding the poor widow, Matt. xii. 42, after the woes and parting denunciations of Matt. xxiii.

[2] My feeling altogether revolts against Lange's notion—unsupported by any shadow of evidence in the text—that the disciples, still terrified by the thought of the tribunal of heretics, asked, not for the sake of the answer, but to warn their Master not to have anything to do with this child of sin.

exegesis, but exegesis must leave room for such a supplementary imagination. Whence did the disciples know that he was *born* blind? Either they were already familiar with him, lying on the way to the temple;[1] or he had begun, as they drew near, his accustomed cry—Take pity on one *born blind.* We need not trouble ourselves to explain how it was that he did not earlier apply to the Helper of the miserable, or was not before brought to Him by others; we never find that no objects of misery were left unhealed—see Matt. xxi. 14 at the close, and Acts iii. 2. Such people as these are ofttimes altogether shut out from what is passing in the world. Pfenninger invents again as follows:—"Seek out the Prophet who has already healed many blind people;" to which advice he replies—"Alas, good Sir, I was *born* blind;" and the rejoinder then is—"That alters the case, then patience till the kingdom of God!"

The disciples themselves think of no healing. The slight and indirect intercession which some have understood in these words has but a very slight foundation; hence others have regarded them as meaning—"Wilt Thou have anything to do with a man who bears in himself so special a curse for sin?" We agree neither with the one nor with the other, but regard them as led by the Lord's pondering regard themselves to contemplate the man, who having been *born* blind *must* remain blind to the end. But this obligation, which they regard in their ἵνα τυφλὸς γεννηθῇ as a Divine purpose, is very mysterious to them; and since the Lord cannot, or rather *may not,* cure such connate defects, they would receive from Him at least some solution of the mystery. It seems to us that St John designs to show that the Lord's *repose* so far communicated itself to them, that they could take this as a fitting time for their question; the very contrary of Lange's supposition, who thinks that "in their *excitement* they had fallen back into the common popular habit of thinking."

[1] If he had sat there for any length of time, Jesus might have observed him before; but that is not said, and He did not always look round upon every one as He passed. Schleiermacher assumes, far too boldly (to serve a purpose) that Jesus had probably often seen this unhappy man, but had passed by without doing anything for him.

They do, indeed, speak according to the popular notion, for they had never risen out of it, and therefore could not fall back into it; the Lord had appeared, also, to confirm it sometimes, as in the case of the paralytic and the impotent man at the pool of Bethesda. Thus they remain in the undisturbed supposition that special sin is the cause of special evil; and that the poor man was an instance of this, being most fearfully born ἐν ἁμαρτίαις, as the Jews malignantly say, ver. 34. But instead of, like these, imputing this with an uncharitable ὅλος to the man himself who was thus born, they go astray upon the matter of the specific guilt of the sufferer, and hence their question. The *or* is simply to be explained—This man himself, or since *we cannot imagine that*, his parents? And this means, again,—And has he been forced from his birth to suffer such misery, without any special guilt of his own? *Consequently* they were constrained to ask the first question, and the only possible answer to it which could float before their minds, was that which Pfenninger gives as the most simple and obvious—The foreseen sin or sinfulness of his life, punished beforehand. In this we agree with Tholuck; such anticipation of punishment,[1] in the administration of God, who knows the future in its beginning, is not so meaningless or unrighteous, especially when contemplated in the modification which von Gerlach gives—"since all earthly punishment involves even as recompense a transition to redemption from itself, God suspended the punishment before the sin, in order to abate the virulence of its outbreak, and to awaken all the more keenly the sentiment of contrition." It is in this spirit that men so frequently make the common remark that it was well for such an one that he had such and such infirmity, else what would he have been! This is much more admissible than the previous notion of von Gerlach, that the *Or* is not to be so rigidly taken as a dilemma, but that a *common hereditary family sinfulness* is spoken of. No, in that case the answer would have been long before given in Ex. xx. 5—but of *that* the disciples are not thinking, because the personal affliction appears to them so grievously severe; and

[1] Compare Esau's rejection, which itself afterwards makes manifest his reprobate spirit.

the problem which they propose lies evidently in the dilemma of this *either—or*.[1]

Thus might we despatch the question, the right understanding of which belongs necessarily to the apprehension of the answer given; but we must briefly allude to and reject those mystifications which we by anticipation have declared to be needless. What necessity is there for supposing that the disciples thought (as Lücke, with Lightfoot and Keil, assumes) of his sinning in his mother's womb? This, however, could only be tolerated, if they are withal supposed to have further thought—But this also is *not imaginable!* But it is a gratuitous and forced hypothesis that they thought of the *pre-existence* of souls (as Cyril supposed), or of a *metempsychosis*, as since Beza's time so many have imagined. It is now pretty generally admitted that this heathen philosophema is not to be attributed to the Jews, even of the time of Christ. True, the *later* Rabbins meddled with this notion, and have many vapid babblings thereupon—such as that the soul of Nabal even entered a stone, and that the builders of the tower of Babel passed into mill-wheels, and the like. The pure Jewish Cabbala itself knew nothing of metempsychosis at first (there is no trace of it in the book Jezira); and the later only teaches the Gilgul (גִּלְגּוּל נְפָשׁוֹת rotatio animarum) and Ibbur (עִבּוּר gravidatio, prægnatio). As to this latter distinction, according to which a previous soul possessed or entered into a soul already born, thus signifying a *double personality*, compare Eisenmenger ii. 85–88. Deep thinkers may have their own thoughts about this last, which in itself is not so meaningless;[2] but the Gilgul is opposed by the ἅπαξ of Heb. ix. 27, and by the entire Old and New Testament, which knows nothing of it at all. Hence the Jews were utterly unconscious of it, until this dogma came to them from the Oriental-Egyptian-Pythagorean-Platonic Syncretism; consequently we have nothing to do with it in connection with our passage. The passage in the Book of Wisdom (ch. viii. 19, 20) which is often thus

[1] In a certain sense and degree Euthymius is right in understanding:—Neither is reconcilable with our notions, the one drives us to the other, backwards and forwards; help us to a right decision!

[2] See Meyer's Blätter für höhere Wahrheit iv. 263, 264.

expounded, admits of another most simple interpretation;[1] and that which is adduced from Josephus is palpable misconception.[2] Finally, to put the extreme case that among the learned this heathenish doctrine had begun sporadically to show itself—what did the blessed disciples know of that?[3]

Ver. 3. The Lord gives a twofold answer to the question—in *word* and *act*. He removes the dilemma of the present case by an οὔτε—οὔτε; points forwards to the works of God to be manifested; and then immediately by an act of healing gives palpable evidence that this man was not born blind in order that he might sit in darkness till death, but that he might see the light of God in a special and most glorious manner. When Strauss asserts that the Lord's saying refers only to this individual case, while elsewhere, as in chap. v. 14, and Matt. ix. 2, the general Jewish notion is confirmed, he simply forgets that those two were also specific cases. But there was a truth in the Jewish notion, which brings it into accordance with the entire Scripture, and was only rendered error by an overstrained application to individual cases; and this the Lord cannot and will not deny. It is an abiding truth that sin alone is the ultimate cause of all evil as it regards the human race as a whole,[4] and hence also as it re-

[1] Although Buddæus Instit. i. 2, 32 adduces this (with the spirits of ch. xvii.) as teaching the προϋπαρξις animarum, and Jul. Müller (v. d. Sünde ii. 100) presupposes this as acknowledged. See, against this, the protest in Schmieder's Vortrag über das Buch der Weish. (Berlin 1853), S. 9, 10. The ἤμην in *parallelism* rather than contrast with ἔλαχον is not to be urged, as the παῖς connected with it (certainly not the pre-existent soul!) shows. Εὐφυής is well known to be used of the soul, its good gifts and talents; thus a "noble nature" in body and soul, but which requires the grace of God in order to ἐγκράτεια. The ἀγαθὸς ὤν is only opposed to the ἔσομαι. See the translation in Kleuker's salom. Denkwürdigkeiten: "Ich war ein kind von guter Art. u. s. w."

[2] Antiqu. 18, 2; and especially bell. jud. 2, 12, where, as well the ἀναβιοῦν as the ἕτερον σῶμα in spite of the μεταβαίνειν certainly means no more than resurrection and glorification.

[3] The folly of attributing this to them convicts itself in Isidor. Pelus. (see Lücke) who makes them say—οὗτος, ὥς φασιν Ἕλληνες, ἢ οἱ γονεῖς αὐτοῦ, ὥς φασιν Ἰουδαῖοι.

[4] Schleiermacher: "That all the evils of life are bound up with sin, is a connection of thought which the human mind has never got free from." In the midst of all the delusions and follies of heathenism, the

gards the connection and transmission of evil between parents and children, in which the unity of the race consists. It is as true that the misdeeds of the fathers are visited upon the children, according to the words of God Himself and the history of all families and people, as on the other hand, that the assurances of Deut. xxiv. 16; Ezek. xviii. 19, 20, protest against perverting this fundamental principle of the Divine government by dispensing with all reference to personal guilt, or by making the evil involve eternal consequences at once. Rieger's remark, again, is perfectly true, that we may not make our Saviour's utterance a universal salve; or regard it as a release of all parents from all participation in the guilt of their children's external or internal transgressions. "Our conception and birth is the channel through which sin and death continue to pervade the world of mankind; and in which the original heritage of evil in body and soul may ofttimes be greatly increased. No human judgment can impose the penalty of this upon any man, but neither can he shake himself free of it, until he has received his justification from Jesus Himself by the testimony of His Spirit." Grotius had a strange notion, based upon the mention of *both* γονεῖς,[1] that the disciples thought of a violation of the law of Lev. xx. 18, from which violation bodily defects often sprung, in the opinion of the Jews. Assuredly these questioners did not go so deeply into the matter; but as it regards *ourselves* there is a general truth involved in the remark of Grotius, that children may and do inherit in many cases corruption as the result of wickedness in sexual commerce, and therefore that in many particular cases the lips of Omniscience, and even the consciences of the sinners, might say in this most specific sense—The parents sinned, and therefore the child is born thus.

But as it regards this present case the Lord *denies* any specific sin on either side as entailing this penalty; and with such an earnest decision as manifests His own superhuman penetration into all its circumstances. Of course, it must be understood that

idea of *guilt* as the source of evil has lain deep in the universal consciousness of man.

[1] This may be, of course, without any detail—either one of the parents or both.

He does not exempt them from having sinned generally.[1] "Neither hath this man sinned—that is, more than those who are not blind; nor his parents—that is, more than those who have seeing children." (Beck, christl. Reden i. 208.) Still more obvious is it that even in the rejected supposition that the disciples had thought of any transmigration of souls, the Lord's expression οὔτε οὗτος ἥμαρτεν does not by any means imply that He admitted and confirmed such an idea.[2] For the case here is very different from that of Lu. xxiv. 39, where the πνεῦμα as the subject of the position is admitted as something actual, and the belief in incorporeal spiritual appearances is confirmed; if the question had been here put—Did he sin before his birth? the answer would signify—That *could* he not, and ye are right in thinking that an unimaginable thing.

But what is the solution which the Lord gives, of the *general* difficulty which is exemplified in this peculiarly mysterious case? First of all, He does not appear to enter at all into the general question—contrary to His wont, to deduce from specific cases general principles. He restricts Himself to this particular case:—"God's design with regard to this man is this, that His works should be made manifest in him, inasmuch as I shall make him an illustrious witness, both in his physical and spiritual sight, to Myself as the Light of the world." But this answer (quite parallel with ch. xi. 4) contains in itself a universal principle too; and we rightly apply it to the many who were possessed, especially in the time of Christ, in whom should be illustrated the casting out of devils by the finger of God. But in the plural τὰ ἔργα there is involved a hint of transition to its universal applicability in all similar cases. What then is its meaning as a solution of every Job-mystery? As we understand its warning and hortatory meaning, it is this—Ask not with too much subtilty, ye children of men; penetrate not with blind

[1] Hence Chrysostom: He did not simply say—οὔτε ἥμαρτεν, but adds—ἵνα τυφλὸς γεννηθῇ. Not giving this as a reading necessarily, but as an exposition.

[2] This is stated with precision, because there is more belief in this transmigration, and more tendency to hunt for it in Scripture, than is generally thought. Schubert deals well with these subjects in his Geschichte der Seele. S. 621 ff.

curiosity into the backward abysses of the connection between guilt and evil, as if ye could, or as if it were necessary that ye should, bring into the clearest light what is deeply hidden in the mystery of God! But look forward, rather, in waiting hope, to the coming works of God's restoring, evil-removing power and love![1] *This* is the Theodicèe, in fact, which God Himself exhibits, and will sooner or later everywhere approve it; all history bears evidence enough to this to induce us to remit confidently to the same God all that still remains obscure. Fikenscher: "If God has been sought and found in misery, the end of affliction has been gained. To investigate further, becomes not the children of God; uncharitably to sit in judgment upon others, is all the more sinful, as short-sighted man knows nothing with certainty, and should think much more of his own guilt than of others'." Beck (a. a. O. S. 209): "Invade not the business of God's majesty—that of sitting in judgment! Thou mayest and thou shouldst co-operate with the Supreme Father in an altogether different business—that of correction, benevolence, and restoration!"

Thus the *works of God* are primarily His healing, delivering works;[2] and if we rightly understand the spirit of the word of Jesus, as well as the spirit of the typical act with which He accompanied it, we shall ourselves, in our own sphere, and according to our best ability, work unweariedly these works of God upon the miserable around us. And if any one appear to our thoughts to have been, through grievous guilt, born to special wo, we shall have this answer ready for all over-curious inquiry —He is also so afflicted that we may take pity upon and help him, or comfort him at least. But, withal, the *universality* of this designedly comprehensive utterance furnishes another and final meaning; for *the works of God*, which will *all* be manifest finally, are very manifold. Can God not heal and help even in connection with the heaviest guilt, the soul for the sake of the salvation of which He so often leaves the bodily evil unrelieved —then are we led to the conclusion, that *misery* in its connection with sin will one day be manifest as a *work of God*, that the

[1] Comp. the beautiful sermon of Nitzsch, Lechste Auswahl S. 60.
[2] Nonnus: ἔργα θεοῦ γενετῆρος ἀλεξικάκοιο.

most singular "freak of nature" will be connected with the hand of the faithful Creator; and that there will be also made manifest those various operations of God's Providence, working secretly and *mysteriously* under these afflictions, which have been ever leading to salvation and life. Just as on the present occasion the poor blind man, beholding the Son of God and teaching the learned, declared plainly the secret blessing of his past blindness.

Ver. 4. Advancing now further, the Lord declares more explicitly what works of God He more especially meant—the works of healing and salvation which He was Himself to accomplish in the world. To effect these was His mission; and He must accomplish them all in the sacred obligation and unalterable counsel of pitying love. Therefore there is a work of God to be wrought upon this blind man. Many think that there is a reference here to the fact that it was the Sabbath—Although on this day My enemies would not permit the works of God to be done. Ebrard sees "a glimmering of this;" but to us the Sabbath does not seem to be referred to at all, or at least to be taken up into that greater *day* for working, of which Jesus here speaks. That His own earthly lifetime is meant, the end of which was not far distant, appears evident from the ἕως, and the reference to ch. viii. 56, and the explanation which follows in ver. 5, and, finally, the parallel of ch. xi. 9, 10 where the period of His unhindered working is most plainly indicated. This is clear enough, but makes it all the more obscure, in what sense He could oppose to His own period of working the works of God, a *night;* and in what sense He could apply that expression in His own case. The simplest and quickest way of despatching the whole saying is of course to understand it as a common proverb:—"Every man has his day's work, no one can work in the night." This would mean—I shall not cease to work in the world until I can work no longer; for a faithful ἐργάτης ends only with the ending of the day. Quite right, but as soon as we look deeper into the matter, and seek to find, as we should do in all our Lord's words, the deeper significance of this application to His own Person, we cannot but regard the *night* as something strange, as also the emphatically universal—ὅτε οὐδεὶς δύναται ἐργάζεσθαι. The absurd comment of Paulus, who takes this as referring to that particular

day, and makes the Lord say that the night was coming when He could no longer effect the cure, has this spark of truth in it, that it was actually drawing on towards evening, and the Lord drew His illustration from that circumstance—The day of My great work is declining.[1] But chap. viii. 56 gives us already the occasion of the saying, and this therefore is unnecessary; nor does it modify the question as to what the night is which approaches for Jesus. What else can it be than the time of His *death*, which is opposed to the time of His life? From this another interpretation does not divert us—"the time of grace and the time of the power of evil"—for the latter or the hour in which the might of darkness bound His wonder-working and healing hands (Luke xxii. 53; John xiv. 30) coincides with that of His death; and, moreover, it is too expressly said ὅταν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ὦ, ver. 5. Baumgarten-Crusius, indeed, expressly declares—"Day and night cannot possibly signify here life and death; there would be something strange and *heathenish* in the words, and quite inappropriate to the person of our Lord, especially in St John's Gospel, since only after the death of Christ was His true spiritual might put forth." But when He opposes the νὺξ of ver. 5 to the "time of His immediate divine energy or saving power," which is the period of Christ's life, it comes precisely to the same thing; and furthermore, the Lord Himself is certainly included in the οὐδείς. *Heathenish* it is not assuredly, but Jewish and Scriptural, that a man can *work* only as long as he lives in the body upon earth; and the Lord's words thus echo the sentiment of Eccles. ix. 10. And under this rule and process of human activity Christ as the Son of man assuredly stands. It may be said, indeed, that His work then began again at once in Hades, the great work of opening the prison house and preaching to the dead:[2] the night, in which no man can work, could put no restraint upon Him; when He entered the darkness it became day, when He entered death it became life. And it is assuredly

[1] So von Gerlach: "It is probable that the day was then declining, and He must hasten the cure; this might *give Him occasion* to remind them all that His great work to enlighten the world, was connected by God's counsels with certain definite periods."

[2] Zeller im Monatsblatt—"We might say that He there performed His night-work."

true that it was His resurrection and exaltation which began a more glorious day; so that it may be conversely said,—*No man* besides Himself could ever before work the works of God, but now first they proceed in their true and great accomplishment through the power of the Spirit in His Apostles. All this is by no means denied; for the Lord is very far from saying literally that the entire period from His death to His return would be the night.[1] (This has not even relatively an objective truth, for see Rom. xiii. 12; 2 Cor. vi. 2.) The truth of His declaration, and its application to Himself, lies in this, that now in the days of His flesh, including His death as the final and consummating act of His victorious life, *the foundation was* laid for all future working whether below or upon the earth, for all the glorious sequel of the development and spread of light and life through the power of the Holy Ghost. The hours of His day of life were thus truly counted out to Him, wherein to perform the duty of the hours; for every word which He spoke in the flesh, every act which He performed for a testimony to the world, during this seedtime for the future glorious harvest, was one living grain of corn more which should spring up in the harvest of the Spirit. As He, according to His own designedly used expression, is the Light, it could not befall Him as it did the admonished unbelievers of ch. xii. 35; He abides ever the Light in the profoundest darkness which may close around Him, He continueth ever to work even as His Father worketh ever! Yet is that subsequent working distinguished from the preceding, even as the harvest is distinguished from the seedtime; and *in that respect* His great redeeming working day is comparable, though under transcendently different conditions, to the working day of every man's life. He can therefore regard the critical period at which His foundation-laying work is ended in death, as men regard it; and term the *hour of death* which awaited Him (though not including any subsequent *state of death!*), in harmony with human feeling, not unknown to Him, concerning living and dying,—*a night* which breaks off His living day. It is

[1] As Müralt in v. Meyer's Blättern iii. 361 comments; whose exposition, with all its ingenious though perilous consequences, we cannot now enter upon.

a subtle, though not insignificant observation that the article is not prefixed. *The* night of death comes to all men in its more rigid sense; and also for Me, there comes, in a certain sense, though differently to be understood, such *a* night. The conclusion then passes into the universality of a proverb—*such as that* of which it is said that *no man* can work in it. Thus does His saying retain its deep fulness of truth; and the *condescension* of its use here appears in this, that by it He speaks pre-eminently of His humanity and the accomplishment of the works of God within the limits of prescribed time; looking away from and omitting His eternally uniform working as God. It is natural that the attempted stoning should lead His thoughts more deeply to ponder and dwell upon His impending death. Thus, thinking of that glorious day which He will open up to His servants for their working in His Divine power, it was His gracious design to represent Himself to them as a *type* of the faithful redemption of the time of human life; this designedly symbolical sense of His words explains to us their peculiarity of structure, as well as the origination of the reading ἡμᾶς instead of ἐμέ.[1]

Ver. 5. In explanation, as already said, of the Lord's meaning in the word day, comes now the intimation of the great distinction between His own and every other man's day of life. Afterwards in ch. xi. 9, 10, the Lord speaks yet more condescendingly in a manner which holds good only of others; and leaves it to His disciples to make its much modified application to Himself. But He could not have *there* spoken as He did, if He had not *previously* testified what is written *here*. Others see the light of this world, there is day and light *for them* through the gift and working of God; but He bears the light in Himself, He *is* the light, He makes the day of the world as long as He is in it.[2] Thus His words redeem themselves and obviate all possible misapprehension. And thus it passes further—for it is ever the

[1] This as it were lamenting ἔρχεται νύξ may be taken in its especial reference to unhappy *Israel*, for whom He so gladly performed individual works of blessing, at least; a long night was to come, and has come, upon this people, since the Light of the world was cut off. But I doubt whether the κόσμος of the following verse would harmonise with this view.

[2] On account of the ὅταν we agree with Kling (Stud. u. Krit. 1836), against Lücke, that it is—*as long as*.

Lord's pleasure to speak thus comprehensively in words chosen to include every reference—into a promise of that specific work of God which was now to be accomplished upon this blind man. Bodily and spiritual enlightenment, quickening, and deliverance are always embraced together in the view of the Spirit; the one not only points to the other, but leads to its attainment. Thus the Lord yields to His own mercy towards the wretched man, and is ready as ever to perform the acts committed to Him of the Father; however well He may know that the Pharisees would be as much hardened against this miracle as they had been against others, and that the night of darkness was not yet to be broken by His miracles—even though the raising of Lazarus were among them. (Comp. Luke xiii. 32, 33.) He can do no other, for He is the Light of the world; He shines forth in His majesty like the sun in the heavens, without keeping back one ray on account of the darkness which was advancing from below.

Vers. 6, 7. How may we suppose the blind man to have listened when his ears caught the sound,[1] so different from what he had been accustomed to hear—"Neither hath this man sinned nor his parents!" That works of God, long destined to be wrought upon him, were now to be accomplished! When the man of God, who so spake, called Himself the *light* of the world, his whole soul assuredly cried out—O God, whose works towards sinners are so marvellous, send *light* even for me!—His overhearing the conversation upon his own case took the place of any other preparatory address to himself; so that we may suppose, in harmony with our Lord's conduct towards him and his own obedience, that there now existed in his soul the beginning of that faith which his healing required. We have already given some explanation at Mar. viii. 23, vii. 33, of the application of the spittle, the external and symbolical accompaniment of the miracle; but let it be further carefully noted how St Mark and St John accord! The adherence to a human custom, that of occasionally, and especially in diseases of the eyes,

[1] And this regard to the listening man was part of the reason why the Lord, without entering further into the question, turned the answer at once into a promise.

applying saliva as medicinal,[1] is the smallest part of the question; more important is the analogy with the Old-Testament miracles as always linked to external means, from the tree at Marah to the salt for the waters of Jericho; but most weighty of all is the fact that here only the humanity of the Lord Himself appears as co-operant and instrumental. We shrink from believing (with many; Hess, for example, and more recently Baur) that this was intended, as being something like work, to assert that the Sabbath was the proper time for such an act; for any such *positive* design seems to us altogether opposed to our Saviour's uncaptious feeling for the day, and the general humility characterising the whole miracle. After He had given the man something for his faith to lay hold of in the clay upon his eyes,[2] He sends him, as a further stimulant to his faith, and as a duty for it to discharge, to the pool of Siloam; just as Elisha had sent Naaman to the Jordan, 2 Kings v. 10. Certainly not *merely* to "wash" away the clay, which may be supposed to have wrought the cure;[3] and still less are we to suppose (with Neander, and the Berlenb. Bible, resting upon ἑώρακας, ver. 37) that the man could already see a little, sufficiently for the purpose of going.[4] But it was that the blind man, like him in St Mark whom the Lord led away from the public road, might go into the undistracted solitude of God's works to look around him first. One leading him by the hand is obviously to be presup-

[1] See the instances in Olshausen. Döpke pushes this too far, speaking of the "common operation."

[2] Thus he *had* eyes; not as Nonnus fables in his detailed description of their creation. He makes the man come into the world as βρέφος ἀνόμματον; and the application of the clay, twice recorded, he explains—ἀνέρος ἔπλασεν ὄμμα, that is, ἐκ χοὸς ἀνδρογόνοιο.

[3] Very dangerous, at least, is the use made of it by Tersteegen (Leben heiliger Seelen, I. Band 5 Kap. am Ende) speaking of the "good Armelle,"—the Lord purified her by means of the sin and temptation which she became sensible of. Though Grotius, too, saw in the clay the impedimenta of the natural man which were to be taken away; and Lampe thus dilates upon it:—"The sinner must first feel his misery, as coming from the earth, and made manifest by the Lord's words; must leave the temple and the law," etc. If the clay must contain any such-like allusion, it would rather be to the blindness which the Lord used and turned into blessing.

[4] As counterpart of this, we have Bahrdt's exposition—Wash thyself there diligently, and thou shalt be in very few days fully restored!

posed. An important point remains to be noticed, and it is one that is very generally overlooked altogether. The Lord (like Elisha) refers the man away from *His* hand and *His* word to the Divine powers and energies which are everywhere really flowing forth in nature, but especially for Israel in the holy land. And in exhibiting this great miracle to the Jews, He orders it so that it seems as if their "refused waters of Siloah" had wrought the cure.[1]

The Evangelist's parenthetical etymology points our attention to the significance of the sending to *Siloam*. This is certainly not to be explained away as a gloss (it is not found in the Syr. and Pers. translations, because in them the word was self-explained); though Lücke, "in spite of all manuscripts, will regard it as an ancient gloss of an allegorist, and never be persuaded that it is St John's!" It is neither trifling, as a token of its unapostolical origin, nor is it verbally incorrect (Strauss asserts both); but it is to be understood by every mind which enters into the whole character of this Gospel, though its exposition may involve the uncertainty which attends all their dimmer intimations. Undoubtedly שִׁלּוֹחַ might originally mean a "spring," or rather "aqueduct" (as Stolz here translates!); and so far fall in with the variation שִׁלֹּחַ, Neh. iii. 15, comp. מוֹצָא, 2 Chron. xxxii. 30. But this does not interfere with or hinder the prophetic use and interpretation of the name, which begins already in Isaiah. As it respects the *passive* signification of the form, the first sense in which it could be taken would doubtless be—"outpoured waters," or "waters sent." But the obscurity of the Hebrew development of forms makes this doubtful; and we may be permitted to refer to our own Lehrgebäude thereupon.[2] Even as this was a fountain sent or given of God

[1] Similarly, only with too much emphasis, Lange brings it into connection with the feast: "The spring of Siloam was at this feast the third great word! Thus He brought the sanctuary of the Jews into co-operation, and exhibited the co-operation of Jehovah in an evident manner before them."

[2] The form גְּבִיר § 37, Nr. 9, which through the resolution of the Daghesh and the lengthened syllable, becomes קִרְמֵלִישׁ, corresponds with this—see the examples in the note. We find in the nomen verbale the construction of the participles especially into these varying forms which § 93, 4, 2, speaks of—see the examples in the note upon the letter S. Even a nomen infiniti-

(which man could do no more than conduct) and streamed forth out of Zion, so is there in a higher sense a water sent from above, the renewing power of the Holy Ghost, the power of the Spirit from on high. When the Lord, having in mind the old interpretation of the prophets, significantly said—Go, wash in the pool of Siloam (ὕπαγε νίψαι εἰς—comp. ver. 11), that signified most pertinently—"to the water, which bears the healing name, the Godsent water!" But when St John expressly points his readers, ignorant of Hebrew and that old interpretation, to this true meaning, it is for us to compare what the Spirit of Christ has further taught, and what our humble investigations may suggest: to despise and reject as spurious, in spite of all manuscripts, what we do not understand, is not consistent with our principles. The Lord of glory may sometimes act, and His Evangelist offer a comment upon it, in a manner *beyond* our instant comprehension. To our humble apprehension, the Lord connected together two designs. He would refer *Israel*, as we have already said, by this prophetic symbol, to the well of salvation which already to faith flowed in their midst, and which was only refused by unbelief; but then also He would shadow forth for the new futurity of His church, how He would send believers after His own first anointing to the washing and first fully illuminating bath of the Spirit—the true *Baptism*.[1] But inasmuch as the Spirit is one with the Lord, even as the Son is one with the Father, Christ Himself remains the essential Siloam, who sends from Himself to Himself; and this may be involved in the masculine ἀπεσταλμένος which the Evangelist uses. Thus there is here no conflict between the conducted water and the sending of the Spirit, nor between Israel's fountain of grace and the fountain of Christianity, nor between him who is sent to the one and him who is sent to the other—all is here united in the typical fulness of meaning. All who are truly versed in Scripture, know that such teaching in such symbols is the earnest and frequent method of the Spirit, and find nothing trifling or unworthy of it; nor will they take objection to that method

vale like שִׁלֹּחַ is to be resolved passively and concretely, see § 95, 5. Hitzig gives the right view, upon Isa. viii. 6.

[1] Which allusion to Baptism, Schleiermacher himself (in his Homilien) makes prominent.

as exhibited in our Lord's own words.[1] It remains, further, to be observed, that the Lord does not, like the ancient prophet, prescribe a sevenfold washing, but one only; as also that the blind man obeys with a more childlike faith than Naaman did. yielding to the proud objections of his own reason.

The subsequent *investigation* and *rejection* of the miracle, as an attestation to Jesus, is thus minutely detailed for its manifold instructiveness and significance; and for the sake of placing the fact fully and luminously before us in its historical truth. The narrative vindicates itself and tells its own tale by its exact marks of characterisation throughout—though only to unprejudiced and attentive ears. And inasmuch as the narrative exhibits the motives of our Lord's words to the restored man, vers. 35–37, and gives us the right principle for their interpretation, we must not pass on without at least a general glance at it.[2]

The investigation of the miracle—evident as the light of the sun—was conducted first by unprejudiced common people, and afterwards by prejudiced and hostile Pharisees: hence a directly opposite conclusion is the result in the two cases.

The *first* investigation proceeds in three questions. The first asks about the healing generally—Was not this man (who now sees) once blind? and the decision of that point comes from the healed man himself, vers. 8, 9. The second question follows —*How* did this healing take place? and receives also a simple, pertinent answer, vers. 10, 11. The third, naturally arising—Where is this wonder-worker? remains ungratified, ver. 12. It results that the matter is brought before the Pharisees, that is before the judgment, ver. 13. Assuredly a *very unbiassed* people,

[1] Bengel's view (accepted by de Wette as St John's meaning) appears to us too stiff and external,—that Siloam must have been so called from antiquity, because Christ would in due time send this blind man thither! As Euthymius: *προεδήλου τὸ μέλλον, τὸν ἀπεσταλμένον ἐκεῖ τότε τυφλόν.* And Nonnus: *ὕδωρ στελλομένοιο προώνυμον ἐκ σέο πομπῆς.* Not to mention the reference to Shiloh, Gen. xlix., in Grotius, and other perversions.

[2] It scarcely needs to be mentioned that we are not obliged to think of the same day, but that the whole may be regarded as continuing through several days.

who receive this "I know not" and bring it at once before the caste whose motto is "We know"—without any further design, either for or against Jesus.

Now follows the *second* investigation of the attested miracle by the prejudiced party, and the rejection of its testimony to Jesus. In ver. 14, the Evangelist prefixes the note that the day was the Sabbath, and yet Jesus had done it! intimating that no other than what followed was to be expected. The process of the whole embraces five questions.

First, the same proper question again—How did the healing (already attested) take place? But the simple repetition of the tale gives rise to a discussion about the person of Jesus, for the faith of some present already ventures to reveal itself, vers. 15, 16.

The second and disjointed question refers to the wonder-worker, but in a different spirit from that of ver. 12, and hence —What sayest thou of Him? This receives a terse and sound answer, ver. 17.

The third question goes back some steps, and should have been the first. Unbelief is frightened at Jesus, and gropes into the evidences—Surely he could not have been blind and now sees? He is confronted with the parents, who, fearful instead of thankful, refer them to the son![1] vers. 18–23. There stand they, ashamed and rebuffed, but do not commit themselves.

The fourth question exhibits a stupid *cunning*, which would intimidate the restored man into a denial of Jesus (this man—as they scornfully say); it is answered at first with much modesty, and referred again to the evident *fact*, vers. 24, 25.

The fifth question, finally, begins in profound embarrassment, but receives a bolder answer, and one which challenges faith in Jesus on the part of the questioners, vers. 26, 27. The result is simply that the innocent truthfulness of the man's incontrovertible testimony for Jesus is turned against himself, in the bitterness of scorn. The restrained enmity to Christ bursts forth in all its violence; although it condescends to what seems to be reason for its conduct, vers. 28, 29. This is still more boldly refuted by the healed man, provoked by their folly, who

[1] Who could, indeed, as soon appears, speak very well for himself!

teaches them to apply an admitted principle to the present case;—but the investigators cast out the witness to truth! vers. 30–34.

The unbiassed party had been content with the simple and assured answer of the healed man himself—*I am He!* Their following question springs from the mere eagerness of curiosity; but the reply is very well-considered, relating as simply as possible the circumstances which had occurred. He *therefore* says (though *thinking* as in ver. 17) without any dogmatism—*a man*, and so on. This means—More I cannot say about the *how;* judge yourselves whether this man has not healed me in the power *of God!* How artless is the word—*I went*, as if a matter of course; and that in regard to a matter which (according to ver. 32) was a thing unheard of in the world! In general let it be remarked how terse, concise, and pertinent are the first replies of this honest man. Ver. 15 is yet briefer than ver. 11; not only, it is probable, in St John's narrative—for the man, questioned again, presupposes the knowledge of the circumstances, which they are inquiring about.[1] He adheres to this character in vers. 17 and 25; until at last in vers. 27 and 30 he waxes earnest and eloquent against the provocation of their obstinate rejection of the truth.

In ver. 15 (let it be noted!) the πῶς ἀνέβλεψεν presupposes the truth of the circumstance brought before them. But in ver. 16 follows a most perverse influence! In ver. 9 the diversity of opinion is removed by the man's own simple affirmation; but here the σχίσμα is thereby *excited*, because the liars divert the question. They say—*this man;* just as the healed man had said before, feigning themselves unacquainted with this *Jesus!* They reply, however, by their "*not of God*," to the inward declaration of their own consciences simply; for the man had not said this. (Comp. chap. viii. 47.) *Because* He keepeth not the Sabbath day:—this sounds right enough generally,

[1] Therefore not naming specially either a man or Jesus, but—He put, etc. (For the man had observed the enmity intimated in ver. 14 as likely to be provoked.) Hence *clay* is placed first—that was all which was to be seen, the whole of the Sabbath work! Finally, the incontrovertible καὶ βλέπω, in the emphatic utterance of delight which one before blind would feel.

but contains two malicious and insidious errors. It was not the Sabbath ordained of God which was broken, but the substituted Pharisaic Sabbath; the *not keeping* is asserted as if the habit of life, while this was a special case, with special circumstances. The *others* are not certain of the common people mingled with them; for ἐκ τῶν Φαρισαίων embraces the ἄλλοι as well as the τινές. Hence we must assume that there were several Nicodemuses among these judges, who bring with them and interject their very honest πῶς δύναται.

Ver. 17. They could not, in their embarrassment, have proposed a more stupid and inappropriate question. That which *they* are summoned to decide, they prematurely ask this man to tell them; so that the instruction he immediately gives them comes as the answer which they themselves sought. At once he says, briefly and plainly—*He is a Prophet!* (In this he is as prudent as modest, for he knew from his parents that the question was whether this man was *Christ.*) What else could they expect? This makes them pause in their impetuosity, and they reflect. Certainly such would be the necessary inference; it is better for us if we can, *not to believe* what was done, not to believe the man himself on whom it was done. (Contrast with vers. 9, 10.) And now they cautiously make inquisition of his parents[1] concerning the matter, to guard against all deception: but their concerted *excommunication*[2] has already begun to react upon themselves, for no one will answer these questions, who can elude them. "He is old enough, ask him!" This declaration, which is at the sametime somewhat ironical, sends them back to the original convincing testimony. They then feign themselves to be more mild, and begin to act hypocritically. The holy formula of Josh. vii. 19 they pervert in their own way; arrogate the glory for *God*, while they mean *themselves*, in opposition to God.[3] "We *know* that this man is a sinner" is in striking con-

[1] Not necessarily, as Ebrard thinks, aged beggars themselves.

[2] It is doubtful whether the several stages of excommunication existed in the time of Jesus; but the συνετέθειντο indicates something official, for which time enough may be supposed. Be it observed that they do not venture to attack Jesus Himself, but His confessors. Another decree, directed against His own person, had not yet been matured.

[3] *Give God the honour!* That means only—Tell the truth, acknowledge

trast with ch. viii. 46. This examination and sentence was designed to overpower the poor common man; it was his place to acknowledge some *deceit* in the matter—for that was the drift of the whole, though they dare not with all their infatuation openly say this, even as they could not have actually thought as much in their own minds.

Ver. 25 exhibits in the first οὐκ οἶδα a pure and genuine humility, though without any of the parents' fear; it, however, involuntarily passes into irony; for the good man maintains his own knowledge of the matter, which was quite independent of their authority; nor is he to be brought to call his benefactor a *sinner*. With his incontrovertible ἓν οἶδα, the utterance of which is rightly taken as a model for all who have been enlightened through Jesus, he stands, like the impotent man (Acts iv.), as a manifest type of the future church of Christ in the presence of the world. He has from the beginning been a pattern, speaking in brief and precise words in reply to the questions which were put to him. And even now he avoids the reproach of ver. 34; modestly evading, and pointing them to the undeniable *fact*. But when these inquisitors, thus driven in a circle, return again, ver. 26, to the beginning of the matter, his patience gives way—he begins himself to put the question, not proudly and bitterly (as Lücke says), but keenly enough. Will ye also be His disciples—like others, *to whom I have told the tale?* This is not spoken in true earnest, but is as much as to say—Are ye indeed such enemies to Him?[1]

Now breaks out, on the other hand, their *wrath*. Μηδαμῶς θέλομεν—thus does their whole being madly cry out in self-condemnation before God's judgment. Μαθητὴς ἐκείνου, whom we had well-nigh stoned already as a Samaritan, a possessed, a blasphemer of God—the very thought or mention of this is to them scarcely less than λοιδορεῖν. They put the question—

some error or deception, submit to an infallible authority! Not, as Nonnus inserts, Thank God, *who has healed thee*, and not this man! For the healing is supposed not to be a fact.

[1] Braune seems to us to do the blind man a double injustice, when he condemns the bitterness of his words. He who had so long and so patiently submitted to inquisition, is not now suddenly become bitter; the artless reply which bursts forth at last is altogether natural and unblameable.

truth answered them—they scorn and reject it at once! As with the people at Capernaum so now, *Moses* is fled to as a defence—that Moses who cried out against their sins and wrote about that future Prophet whom all must hear or be cut off. The disciples of this Moses they term themselves, even while their unbelief is involving them in his denunciations—but as to *Him*, whose gracious and significant Jesus-name (expressed in ver. 11) they never once took into their lips, they had *known* before that He was a sinner;—such an one, however, as had continually convicted them of their sins, but whom no man could ever convince of sin in Himself! And now *they know not* His πόθεν ἐστίν; as He Himself indeed had told them—because they knew not God. They fly for refuge to the longpast speaking of God with Moses, against whom, however, they rebel as their fathers did; thus vainly endeavouring to escape from the present which offends and penetrates their eyes and ears. They have no thought of the meaning of *Siloam*, the water of God's power now become as that of *Bethesda!*

We know not! And because they know not, therefore none of the poor sheep of these wise and good shepherds is to dare, under ban of excommunication, to know. But the blind man, standing before them, sees now: so much he knows! The Son hath made him free in order to his knowledge of the truth, before he knows and can name the Son. Neither contempt nor entreaty can move him to fear or submission. In the extreme impatience of his holy indignation against their suppression of the truth, and yet, unlike these scorners themselves, still thoughtful and modest, he says: Ἐν γὰρ τούτῳ θαυμαστόν ἐστιν—in all this matter there is this one thing marvellous, the greater miracle of the two, *that ye know not!*[1] Your becoming blind shows as strangely hardening an influence of this Jesus your opponent upon you, as in my case ὅτι τυφλὸς ὢν ἄρτι βλέπω. Thus have we something like our Saviour's final decision by anticipation here! And now the seeing man begins to lead and to teach the blind, lays down the universal position, the truth

[1] Thus we understand the words in the sense which the other reading ἓν γὰρ τοῦτο would only render more definite. And Nonnus was quite right: τοῦτο γάρ ἐστι τὸ θαῦμα πολὺ πλέον—your ignorance is a greater wonder than my healing!

well known in Israel for which he asserts the οἴδαμεν of all, in order that he may then in vers. 32, 33, through the case in hand arrive by the soundest logic at a certain and irrefragable conclusion. He takes it for granted, in his fundamental sense of truth, that Jesus, though he had not seen or heard Him do so, had *asked in prayer* the power which healed him; and thus anticipates what this same Gospel afterwards declares for the full understanding of all the miracles of our Lord, ch. xi. 41. It has been said that the position of ver. 31 is not of universal force, but only in the application here intended; and it might further be added that it is the expression of simple and erring Judaism. But it is better to say that it is the pure truth; and to be understood in a very scriptural sense, indeed like many similar sayings in the word of God. Job xxxv. 13, xxvii. 9; Ps. xvii. 1, xxxiv. 16, lxvi. 18, cxlv. 19; Prov. xv. 8, 29, xxviii. 9; Isa. i. 15, lix. 1, 2, etc.

These unrighteous judges end the matter by casting him out. The seeing man is decreed back, by those who finally deny away his seeing, to the supposed curse of his blindness! The ὅλος means (like ch. xiii. 10) the entire man as he was born;[1] but here the διδάσκειν shows that it meant further—blind in body and soul! By this ἐξέβαλον ἔξω, which is first to be understood in its literal sense, he became an ἀποσυνάγωγος, although (which Klee needlessly contests) he had not yet confessed Jesus to be the Christ.

Vers. 35–37. The matter is swiftly spread abroad. Jesus hears of it. (Here we may interpose days, or one day at least.) The Good Shepherd seeks His poor sheep cast out by the wicked ones; the Son of God will reveal Himself to him who, for His name's sake, is reviled and evil-intreated of men; and He rejoices against the whole host of the Pharisees over this one mendicant soul whom He has won. We may be assured that the good man himself would long *to see* the man of God, who was called Jesus. We can only account for his not hastening to Him immediately after his cure, by calling to mind his first tumultuous amazement on recovering his sight, and the strangeness of all objects through which he must make his unaccustomed way.

[1] Theophylact: πᾶς ἄνθρωπος ἐκ γενετῆς.

The wondering neighbours surrounded him at once with their investigations, and after that he was led away to the Pharisees; so that in him there had been nothing wanting. Dost thou believe in the *Son of God?* This remarkable question has been turned by some into a direct form—"I see thee to be a true Israelite, who believeth in the Messiah—and the Person, in whom thou hast already believed as a prophet, is He—thou hast approved thyself a dependent and confessor of Him, who is not merely a prophet, but the Christ Himself!"[1] But it appears evident through this whole Gospel (see especially ch. x. 33, 36, xix. 7) that υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ was not even to the learned, much less for one of the common people, equivalent to Χριστός; and Lücke was not justified in reproducing the old assumption of the "popular sense" of this formula. How inconsistent in that case would be the fact that Jesus should forbid (like the Sanhedrim) His disciples to announce Him as the *Christ*, and Himself constantly and carefully avoid that name—all the while persistently testifying that He was the *Son of God.*

This therefore does not satisfy. It is manifestly our Saviour's purpose to reward the honest and unfaltering avowal of this man, who had known and confessed Him as a prophet and as *of God*, by guiding it to its fullest consummation. But how is it that He *asks* after this very faith? This will not be difficult of apprehension, when we remember the *transitional, helping* sense of this gracious question. It may, indeed, sound at first as a most suggestive and prompting inquiry—Believest thou *already!* But then it passes over into another meaning: Art thou not now ready to believe, if thy Healer now fully reveals Himself to thee—as the *Son of God?* Lampe: Tune ille es, qui propter fidem in Jesum, quem dicunt esse Christum, acerbitatem nostrorum magistrorum expertus est? An tu post has molestias *etiamnum* in filium Dei *credis?* Quite right, down to the last word, which we would substitute, as its interpretation, by—*credere vis?*

The questioned man understood all this very well. He naturally recognised *Jesus* at once, though He had not seen Him

[1] Hess. So Teschendorff—"Thou hast witnessed a good confession; thou believest on the Son of God!"

when he was healed, by His never-to-be-forgotten voice; and it was impossible for him to think that He would refer him to any other than Himself. He *feels* the meaning of the question. But because "Son of God" is a word which goes beyond his previous knowledge, he remains true to his incomparably self-possessed and tranquil character. He does not think, however, or ask about this new dogmatical term, the inmost truth of which, indeed, had been already almost expressed in his anticipating παρὰ θεοῦ, ver. 33; but his answer in itself is quite sound:—I know not yet the Son of God, and how can any one believe on a Person unknown? Yet he does not utter this last directly, but proceeds at once to a καὶ τίς ἐστι; which involves as much. His reply is affirmative and *believing* by anticipation, it promises faith as soon as *Jesus* shall say who He is. It means as much as —Art Thou Thyself He? And then comes the answer—*I am He!* going beyond ch. iv. 26. This distinction conferred upon him, the honour of hearing such a word, superabundantly compensates him for all the contumely he had endured. Thus there are many who have received much grace from Jesus, but know Him not yet perfectly, though they boldly avow what they do know in faith; but there is a full revelation awaiting all such, and the Lord gives here a symbolical type of all such cases. Remark, finally, that the Lord in His grace does not say at once —I am He; but places first—*Thou hast seen Him!* This He speaks in sympathy with his new power *to see;* as it were entering into his own joyful ἀνέβλεψα and ἄρτι βλέπω, vers. 11, 15, 25. Thou who now canst see Him while thou hearest Him who speaks to thee! It is certain that the ἑώρακας in the physical sense signifies his seeing at the present interview—even when He was asking thee if thou believest in Him;[1] but it is further probable at least that the Lord has also a spiritual meaning:—Thou knowest Him, yea in thine implicit faith thou hast already acknowledged Him, without knowing Him by this name. Thus the Lord's words most strikingly pass over into what follows, ver 39, concerning the *seeing* of the blind.

[1] Certainly he had not seen the Lord before at his healing. Nor can we limit it to Teschendorff's sense—"Thou hast beheld Him already, in the healing power which came to thee!" though this has its truth in the subsequent and additional spiritual sense which we assert.

LAST PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF JESUS CONCERNING HIS PERSON AND WORK. THOSE WHO SEE BY FAITH; AND THOSE WHO ARE BLIND THROUGH UNBELIEF. THE HIRELINGS AND THE TRUE SHEPHERD.

(Ch. ix. 39–x. 18.)

We can scarcely suppose that Jesus "in the public way" announced Himself as the Son of God, and received this man's worship. It is not recorded whether His disciples, or any of them, were present; but even this is not probable. Ver. 41 requires us to assume an interval of time, and a change of place, between vers. 39 and 40; but after that all is strictly connected down to ch. x. 18. The incident just recorded, with its concomitant spiritual enlightenment of the blind man in order to his faith, and its manifestation of the blind infatuation of the unbelieving Pharisees against Him, gives the Lord occasion calmly to exhibit, and gives Him words to illustrate, the *contrast between faith and unbelief*, which constantly and for ever separates men from one another. His smitten opponents still lurk in the way, and answer Him once more by a reckless challenge. He answers them, at first, by a direct, explanatory confirmation of His words; and then appends a parable which exhibited the wicked pastors of Israel in their true character, while it gives to all who still *hear His voice* a final great testimony concerning Himself. And in this light it must be viewed in connection with its continuation at the feast of Dedication down to the utterance of ver. 30, and its vindication down to ver. 38.

Ver. 39. This saying is addressed to the disciples, and intended to set them right upon all that had transpired; the result and issue of which is, according to the Lord's wont, comprised in one pointed and easily remembered expression. Even if this blind man had not at once come to see in order to faith in the Son of God, the Lord might still have spoken as He does; for He allegorises continually, pointing from every outward appearance to its indwelling significance; and His example may encourage us to do the same, in spite of the warnings of a cold

sobriety. But on the present occasion His doctrine has a literal fact for its base. The Lord beholds shadowed forth in this occurrence—and beholds it not in scorn, but in sorrowful indignation—the consequence of His coming into *this* world.[1] Inasmuch as this *result*, in the relation between light and darkness, between divine truth and man's perverseness, is a result foreseen and necessary, it may be stated in the much contested ἵνα to be purposed and aimed at; although it is self-understood that the Light of the world, in its first and original design, would rather make all men see, and would blind none. Κρίμα (a form which, as contradistinguished from κρίσις, chap. iii. 19, embraces rather the effect and result) is assuredly not simply equivalent to distinction, but signifies an actual *judgment*, since it must be right and well-pleasing to God that His truth should be concealed from the wise and prudent, for their deserved punishment. (Matt. xi. 25, 26.) What is said in Matt. ix. 12 of the whole and the *sick*, amounts almost to the same: there as here the sense must be supplemented—*in their own eyes;* in this passage, then, those who know themselves to be blind and those who regard themselves as seeing. It corresponds with St John's peculiar selection of the discourses; and the expression refers here preeminently to contemplation as knowledge.[2] We are spiritually by nature *born blind*, and to know and confess this our blindness is *our* first and sole seeing; out of this the grace of the Lord can bring a full restoration of sight—and this is the kernel of the word in its relation to the occasion which gave it birth. The *being made blind*, however, as happening to those who are essentially blind already, is partly an ironical expression for remaining blind, and partly points to the further truth that unbelief tends to *increasing* blindness and hardening. The rigid antithesis will scarcely allow us, with Tholuck, to subdivide the second clause,—they are made blind, either in their own eyes when they waken up to self-knowledge, *or* in their more consummate blinding. For the former is already more rightly in-

[1] Τοῦτον *here* is used with a distinctive emphasis, and can be better felt than paraphrased.

[2] The remark of Drusius, that in the Rabbinical writings the wise are termed פִּקֵּחִין, see Buxtorf. Lex. may be a uselessly learned reference, yet there is something instructive in it, comp. also Ex. xxiii. 8 with Deut. xvi. 19.

dicated in the first member as βλέπειν; and those who suppose themselves βλέποντες *cannot* return back as such into a *saving* blindness—this is the very *judgment* denounced!

The question of ver. 40, which bursts forth from their offended official dignity, is certainly not uttered in such scornfulness as would say—"Are we then, with our sound eyes, blind—bodily blind?" Nor are we to regard them as "acting as if they supposed that Jesus was speaking of physical blindness alone." (Fikenscher.) O no, they understand the Lord full well: they note, at least, that He describes *them*, in opposition to him who now *sees*, as *blind;* and indeed as *being made blind!* (which is much more than Olshausen's—"He speaketh against us!" such generality being here not to be thought of). But they go on proudly, betray what they have noted, and have neither time nor inclination to dissemble. Consequently, it is most obvious to understand—Are we then already become blind in Thy light? And it is not to be alleged against this that the answer of the Lord is not immediately pertinent to that; for He really desires for them only that proper blindness which might be healed, of which *His own* word had spoken, instead of that evil incurable blindness denied by themselves. The only thing which could tempt us to understand them as referring to themselves alone the *first* μὴ βλέποντες, would be the καί as interpreted in connection with the proud official ἡμεῖς—Are *we* also blind, like the ignorant people, so that Thou must make us see too? But we think that this is not even to be appended to the meaning—making the sense: How meanest Thou this of us? Are we still blind—or become totally blind? For in these words, which immediately seize upon the Lord's, their τυφλοί can only retort His τυφλοί; and they are too insolent to let such a word pass their lips, even in scorn, as—Must we then also become Thy disciples (ver. 27) that we may see? When the faction of Korah spake unto Moses—Wilt thou put out the eyes of these men? there was at least the evidence of their senses that he had not led them into the good land, but had killed them in the wilderness. But here shone the Light of the world with His brightest effulgence, here was the last and greatest sign undeniably before their nevertheless denying eyes:—and even then they ask—Meanest Thou *us?* Are we then also *blinded?*

Ver. 41. Then does the Lord press them more severely with His word, and makes their daring λέγειν their inexcusable sin. *If ye were blind*—cannot possibly now be regarded, contrary to the connection of the previous discourse and their own question, as ascribing to them any actual *seeing*.[1] Kuinoel gives it rightly,—If ye held yourselves, understood yourselves to be, blind. Glassius also maintained the same, because the antithesis of the second member required it. The comparison with ch. xv. 22, 24, tends to confuse, for the thought is there quite different, and viewed under the other aspect of the question. As we have said, the sincere soul sees in this light its blindness; and that of itself is a measure of seeing which is salutary and admissible. "Ah that ye thought and said—We are blind, heal Thou us! Then would your sin be soon removed by the knowledge of the truth; then would ye at least be saved from the sin of wilful and lying unbelief!" The Lord explains their question—"Are we blind?" by their saying, "We see!" In this word, however, there lies the greater sin of infatuated enmity: comp. Wisd. xiv. 22. This is the sin of *unbelief*, which *will* not see or become seeing; and for this ch. xv. 22 is a correct parallel.[2] De Wette contends against this on account of the μένει, according to which ἁμαρτία would be only their present sinful condition, as ch. viii. 21, 24. But to his view is opposed the οὐκ ἂν εἴχετε of the first clause; according to which the ἁμαρτία *here* must be the sin which is added to all the former, which hinders forgiveness and healing, and which is the sole condemnable sin here referred to. And the fact that this

[1] As Cyril in Lampe. Hezel: "Since ye have understanding enough, ye confess and feel it yourselves!" Olshausen: "If there were wanting in you all capacity to know the divine," and so Lücke. Similarly Neander: Ye have more knowledge and perception, use it only aright. This does not apply, nor does von Gerlach's: "They were in a certain sense seeing, but this should have served to show them that in a higher sense they were blind." For Christ attributes to them in no sense a βλέπειν, He rather condemns their λέγειν ὅτι βλέπομεν. The analogy of sick and whole does not suit; for if the Pharisees were in a certain sense the whole, and on that account the more sick, yet that certain sense in which they were whole, was only—*in imagination!*

[2] "No man is blinder than he who will not see, and this refusal to see has here an interest at stake," Kant, über die Buchmacherei, S. 20.

guilt, as consisting in their infatuation and obstinacy, *remains* in its very nature, is unpardonable, and not to be healed as such, gives its keenest edge to this discourse; and places these words, essentially speaking, on a level with the word concerning blasphemy against the Holy Ghost. Ἔχειν ἁμαρτίαν stands for *guilt* not merely in ch. xv. 22, 24, but also in ch. xix. 11, in the same sense as here.[1]

The beginning of *parables* which is intimated with regard to the Synoptical arrangement of discourses in Mar. xii. 1 (see our exposition, Vol. iii.), begins somewhat earlier both for the blind rulers, and the common people at large; yet St Mark is so far right as this παροιμία is not distinctly a παραβολή, as we shall show more fully. The connection of the unbroken discourse is not far to seek. That "*we also*" of official pride, signified—we also, the leaders and the pastors of the people! The Lord now speaks, with a gracious intention to awaken some of the better-disposed to self-knowledge and healing by an exhibition of their blindness,—I will now hold up the mirror to you, and show you what kind of "shepherds" you are, and who alone is the true Shepherd! It is an idle and needless supposition that His words were suggested by the neighbourhood of the place where the sacrificial sheep were kept, or anything of the like kind (such as Neander's view of a flock in the field). The occasion itself was quite sufficient introduction to one of our Saviour's current similitudes; and the Pharisees versed in Scripture must have thought, as soon as He commenced, upon such places as Ezek. xxxiv. and Jer. xxiii.—many of them indeed probably upon Zech. xi. So that the Lord utters this equally profound and gracious similitude, which reflects light upon the past condition of Israel as well as upon the great future of His new flock, for the good both of the learned and the common people; taking it from the Scripture for the one, and from common life for the other.[2]

[1] Jul. Müller improperly maintains "that it indicates only the actual fact of sin, the ἁμαρτάνειν or ἡμαρτηκέναι." (i. 238).

[2] This is the only time that in detailed, parabolical exhibitions *animals*

The *central point* of the whole is the Lord's *testimony to Himself* as the good Shepherd in the highest sense of the word. First, however, He speaks preparatorily, vers. 1–6, concerning human shepherds generally, anticipating and paving the way for what follows: He then, ver. 7, speaks clearly of Himself in His ἐγώ εἰμι, but at first only as the *door;* He then designates the *shepherds* as also sheep, who must first go in through Him, and (with the sheep) go out; *from this follows*, finally, ver. 11, the plain declaration, that One alone, Himself, is both the *door* and the *shepherd* of all shepherds and sheep alike. The beautiful text has been much obscured, and its exposition has been very much perplexed, by the failure to apprehend this simple development: either the whole has been regarded as one continuous παραβολή, every separate sentence coming under the same general interpretation, or all connection between the first and second part has been, on the other hand, effectually severed. We shall therefore strive to give, yet more precisely, a glance over the whole which may adjust every part.—

I. Concerning the true and the false shepherd generally,—yet so as that the latter does not merit or receive this name *at all*—in order to a transition to Christ Himself, who is in the *fullest* sense the Shepherd. The fundamental difference, or the *entering in* to the fold through the right *door*, vers. 1, 2. The difference as to the result, or the *leading out* of the sheep:—the true shepherd (as the *consequence* of the former) is admitted by the keeper of the door, is acknowledged by the sheep as their shepherd, and leadeth them out, going before them as they follow him: but the stranger they follow not, from him they flee. (Vers. 3–5.)

II. Medium of the transition, coming out more definitely—concerning Christ as the *door*, which must signify no less than the only Chief-Shepherd. First—the door to the sheep, for all true under-shepherds—I am the door, and whosoever comes in *before* Me (independent of, besides, πρὸ ἐμοῦ being opposed to δι' ἐμοῦ), is a robber! (Vers. 7, 8.) Then more comprehen-

occur; the distinction, however, between this and the *fable* is strictly maintained, since the animals appear in their own nature, and besides that only in their relation to man.

sively—I am the door *in general*, both for shepherds and sheep. (Ver. 9.)

III. *Consequently I am the true and the good Shepherd* in the sole and supreme sense! This is now fully exhibited as the object to which the introduction tended; first, however, in a previous contrast, then absolutely, and without figure, in plain words, and passing into prophecy.

1. In contrast with the *enemy* and his servants.
   a. The *first* contrast with the *thief*, has regard to the design and result:—the thief wills to destroy, I will give life, ver. 10. (In the German, vers. 10, 11. Here begins preparatorily the abstract discourse.)
   b. The *second* contrast with the *hireling* and the *wolf* in regard to their relative *behaviour;* in which the hireling, however better in other respects, is like the robber, and *all* who are not shepherds are regarded as confederates of the wolf, and servants of the enemy. I give *My* own life for the sheep (the prophecy already begins), but the hireling leaves their life to the wolf, *οὐ μέλει αὐτῷ περὶ τῶν προβάτων.* (Vers. 11–13.)
2. Christ the good Shepherd described independently and in Himself. The figure is continued at first, but gradually recedes, and then at last the words are plainly and expressly spoken. Thus there is first the mutual knowledge and bond of love between the Shepherd and *His* sheep:—asserted in itself ver. 14, then more fully described in its ground, expression, and final aim, vers. 15, 16. Then is clearly declared the death and resurrection of the *Son of God*, by which He approves Himself the great and good Shepherd of the sheep, of the men who are to be, and suffer themselves to be redeemed. (The close of the whole testimony in the plainest assertion and prophecy.) This is the good pleasure of the Father, or the wise counsel of His love; but it is also the voluntary expression of the love of the Son; and thus it is, in the sense of ver. 30 afterwards, the commandment or commission of the Father to the Son. (Vers. 17, 18.)

If expositors had not been so generally indisposed to make or to discover the arrangement and plan of these discourses, they would not have been so much at a loss with this interwoven *παροιμία*

and *μαρτυρία*. Lampe, for example, does not generally contemn or neglect formal systematising, but his arrangements are rather stiff and logical than organic developments of the sense; hence he falls into the error which was so common among the Fathers, and prematurely refers everything in this paragraph (vers. 1–6) to Jesus Himself.[1] In consequence of this, the whole and entire fulness of meaning is more or less dissipated by forced applications. Nothing can be plainer than that he who entereth in at the door cannot be properly as yet the door itself, although every shepherd, being what he ought to be, points to *the One*, true and ideal Shepherd.

Vers. 1, 2. As soon as the Lord began to speak of sheep, they who were addressed in His *λέγω ὑμῖν* must have perceived His aim, and thought in themselves—These are the sheep of God's pasture (Ps. c.) whose shepherds *we* are! The article *τὴν αὐλήν* presupposes this ability to apprehend His meaning, and indicates no less than if it had been said—God's sheepfold, Israel. *Αὐλή*, we need scarcely remark, signifies a fold or inclosure under the open heaven—Heb. מִכְלָא or בְּצִרָה, Chald. בְּצִירְתָּא, Micah ii. 12. That is not the pasture itself, or the space enclosed, but the external demarcating bound, such as Israel alone as a people possessed in their Theocracy (ver. 16). A thief asks not for the door, cares not if it is shut; he leaps over and in, wherever he can; see Joel ii. 9; Jer. ix. 21. We cannot understand what Lücke (3 Aufl. S. 406) means by saying that the *door* and the porter have no distinctive import in the parabolical theme; nor how he precisely interprets them, for he does give an interpretation, and does not deny the subsequent application to our Lord. The door may certainly, at the outset of the investigation, be intended to intimate the true calling, the authorised and valid appointment to office in the church of God (the opposite in Nonnus—*σκολιὴν ἐπηλυσίην*), and so primarily the external true vocation to appointed function in the theocratic economy: and thus the *casus obliqui* of the interlopers into office of that age were by anticipation condemned.[2] But if the

[1] As Neander also does, and in part Schleiermacher.

[2] Semler: Illa descriptio videtur tangere istorum temporum pravitatem; pontifices et Synedrium utebantur variis artibus et adjumentis, ut propositum suum consequerentur, etc.

Pharisees were disposed to rest there, ver. 7 would enlarge their views. The external ordinance, however right, may be lacking in internal fitness, in the true calling and entering, that is, through the Chief Shepherd, in His name, and through faith in Him. The shepherds of that day entered in without humble and genuine faith in the God of Israel, without a true perception of the fundamental point of Israel's doctrine; not as the ministers of the expected Messiah, and as preparers of His way in whose person God Himself would be their Shepherd. They came rather with vain imaginations and gratuitous delusions of a false God and a false Messiah; consequently in reality they made themselves the door, they came in their pride and prejudice among the sheep in their own way, that is, ἀλλαχόθεν in opposition to the right door; and that, too, under the name of shepherds. But the Lord declines to give them this title, and chooses one more suitable to them. (Comp. Matt. ix. 36, μὴ ἔχοντα ποιμένα.) Similarly does He deal with the beautiful designation of the *sheep*. It might appear at first that all Israel was referred to, all who were embraced by the inclosure of the theocracy, but ver. 3 shows us that this is not the Lord's intention. He now signifies only the susceptible, those whom He foreknows, as the proper object of the pastoral office; those who through unfaithfulness were scattered. It is essential to the whole discourse that this should be accurately noted, for it is made evident by vers. 8 and 16, and 26; and is also in the installation of Peter, ch. xxi. 15–17, which refers back to ch. x., incontrovertibly proved. They are the τεταγμένοι εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον, Acts xiii. 48,[1] or the עֲנִיֵּי הַצֹּאן הַשֹּׁמְרִים אֹתִי Zech. xi. 11, comp. upon Matt. x. 16. They are true sheep, in their genuine nature as their types exhibit themselves: he who does not distinguish the voice of the Shepherd, and follow him to pasture, is no sheep but a goat (Matt. xxv. 32), however he may seem to be in the flock. Luther says of sheep, "this simple creature has this special note among all animals, that it quickly hears the voice of the shepherd, follows no one else, depends entirely on him and seeks help from him alone, cannot help itself, but is shut up to another's aid." Yea, such as are after this sort, are

[1] But this must have no predestinarian application: see our Auslegung der Reden der Apostel, Th. i. S. 380.

the sheep and they alone! The poor sheep is unprotected, exposed to the danger of wandering, weak and infirm in going, and so forth, but yet tractable, docile, and patient. "It is so created as to require of necessity a shepherd,[1] and can never do well except under his protection and care." (Fresenius.) There is much in all this which may be superciliously laughed at as trifling, but which finds its full justification in the accordance of scriptural and natural symbolism.[2]

Ver. 3. The *porter* in the similitude is a servant whose province, according to ancient custom (Mar. xiii. 34), was to remove the wooden bolt from within, and guard the door which was generally but ill secured. We cannot admit that there is nothing in the interpretation which can correspond to this expression; more especially as it directly leads to a new and critical point:—he who enters through the door, is thereby known and acknowledged to be the right; he only therefore *can*, properly speaking, *enter in*. The opening on the part of the porter, and the hearing on the part of the sheep, are correlatives; and the θυρωρός is thus also a keeper of the sheep, who stands in close connection and concert with the ποιμήν. The porter and the Shepherd know and understand each other full well! Whom then must our interpretation make the former? This will compel us to penetrate that preparatory undertone of meaning which we have already attributed to this first section. The shepherds here are indeed under-shepherds; but the singular which embraces them all, as well as the one door through which they enter, indicates that every under-shepherd must come only as the representative of Him who is essentially the true Shepherd. This it is to which the porter belonging to the door has its true reference. It is not (as Fikenscher, with good intention, says) that Jesus is

[1] This has been literally true, from the time of Adam and Abel. The domestic sheep is a legacy of paradise. The beasts generally are not tamed from an original wildness, but appear rather to have lapsed into wildness, just as this alone is the truth with regard to man himself. Comp. Andr. Wagner. Gesch. der Urwelt S. 498.

[2] Steinmeyer says truly—"There is no similitude in nature which so aptly exhibits the dependence and essential helplessness of man." But more than that, none better exhibits what his docility and devotion to his helper and guide should be.

door, and porter, and shepherd, all in Himself—for why then are vers. 2 and 3 in distinctive juxtaposition? Nor is it, as according to Bengel, God the Father who opens an entrance for Christ, and all who come in His name; for Tholuck is quite correct in his view that such a ministry would be inappropriate to the *Lord* of the flock.[1] But it is, according to the opinion of antiquity, *the Holy Ghost*, the guardian of the Church, who opens the door of the Kingdom of God, co-operating with the Redeemer and His Shepherd-office. It may be said, in the comprehensive sense, that the Spirit of God opens everything that is hidden in things pertaining to man's salvation; hence Origen (in his epistle to Gregory, Philocal. c. 13) promises the reader who knocks at the door of Scripture, that this porter will open to him its hidden mysteries. But what is it that in this case He opens? Obviously, first of all, the door of the fold, the fold itself. But what does this mean? We must go deeper into its meaning and not be content with the mere freedom to preach and to call (the door of the word, Col. iv. 3; 1 Cor. xvi. 9; 2 Cor. ii. 12); for he who does not reach the sheep themselves, to however little purpose, cannot be said to have *entered in* to them. Now, as this opening of the door is the preparation for the hearing of the sheep which follows, we must understand that the opening of their hearts is also intended, Acts xvi. 14.[2] For although in another point of view the hearer himself must open to the Lord (Rev. iii. 20), yet must this be through the influence of Divine grace. Of such as close themselves against the good Shepherd, conspiring with the thief as the stolen property already belonging to *Him*, or anticipating the figure, cast themselves under enchantment into his jaws, the discourse is not *now* making any mention. These are not *sheep* of the *fold* as here intended: with them the Shepherd, seeking in the desert, has to do, but not the Shepherd as He is represented coming into the fold and leading His own to pasture.

All now proceeds according to consistent and well-grounded

[1] Not to mention other interpretations, which rest upon a false historical basis, such as Moses or John the Baptist!

[2] With which again Acts xiv. 27 corresponds, and teaches us how manifold are the comprehensive applications of this "opening of the door" in Scripture.

order, according to the natural course of things in the shepherd's duty in the East, the spiritual pastoral operations strictly corresponding. *Preaching* in general is no other than the calling of individuals, and finds its consummation in the special *care of souls:* the leading out to pasture requires then the *going before* in his own life and example. For as Steinmeyer says—"he who cannot guide himself, but is contented with calling others, may be a teacher or even a counsellor, but is worth nothing as a *pastor*." No pedantry shall deter us from interpreting the whole thus; else should we oppose that most living and blessed exposition which the Spirit of the Lord has never failed to give of these words in His Church. The whole resolves itself, at last, into the profound and gracious close—the sheep *know* the voice of the Shepherd! The reading φωνεῖ lowers the sense, and is wanting in the living force of καλεῖ which suits the ὄνομα, and makes it manifest that the sheep are intelligent souls. Not only in the ancient Bucolics and Idylls of poets, but even in our times and in the West, shepherds are found to give the literal sheep distinctive names. But the calling of the redeemed by name has a very profound significance in the similitude, compare, *e.g.* Isa. xliii. 1, xlix. 1; Ex. xxxiii. 12.[1] The *Lord* knows and calls by name the *souls* which are His, just as He knows and names the host of heaven, Isa. xl. 26; Ps. cxlvii. 4. And this is in a sense appropriate to every under-shepherd, though perfectly and absolutely true only of the one Chief-Shepherd.

The calling by name is an evidence of mutual knowledge, and this again is an evidence of the right of propriety, exhibiting the confidential familiarity and fellowship of possession; hence the emphatic τὰ ἴδια. Lange (following the ancient view, in which the Hirschb. Bibel and Richter concur) understands by these ἰδίοις "His own sheep in a peculiar sense, His own elect and beloved ones, already acquainted with His voice," whom then the residue of the flock rush after! But this rends the unity of the whole figure, and is contrary to the very letter,

[1] Something very much more, because referring to the individual, than Schleiermacher thinks, who, with his customary infelicity, finds here no other "prophetical word" than such as gave His *people* Israel a name

which exhibits *the sheep* as without distinction knowing and following the shepherd. We hold with Bengel—omnes sunt propriæ, coll. ver. 12, sed hoc epitheton magis congruit cum appellatione nominatim factâ, quam cum auditu. We have already said, moreover, that ἴδια only gives the *ground* of their being called κατ' ὄνομα.[1] It is an equally false interpretation of the *leading out*, which regards them as led away from the rest: for how should these be left in the fold without pasture, who yet are His sheep, who have *heard* His voice, that is, according to vers. 6 and 8, have acknowledged it in obedience? The interpretation which, based upon the rejected notion that Christ is here immediately and alone the shepherd, considers them to be led by Him out of the Old Testament into His new church and dispensation (so Lampe), is entirely perverted. We may surely call this exegetical trifling: but do not lay ourselves under the same imputation in making a remark which may represent the innermost sense of the expression, viz., that the αὐλή is only the external constitution of the church for the protection and repose of the flock, but is not the pasture itself, and, consequently, that they must be led forth to the fresh, free pastures of God, instead of being left to the too much prized dry provision of the *penfold* (or *church*)!

Ver. 4. Whether τὰ ἴδια πάντα is to be accepted with Lachmann and Tischendorff in the repetition of the words, we must leave undecided; certainly it gives an additional emphasis—He leaves none behind! Ἐκβάλλειν is manifestly the same with the mere ἐξάγειν, as we remarked before on Matt. ix. 38; the Sept. uses it for הוֹצִיא, 2 Chron. xxiii. 14, xxix. 5, 16. Any stronger meaning derived from βάλλειν would contradict the genius of the passage, for the meek sheep are supposed to recognise their names, they already know the voice, and are so tractable that the shepherd needs only to go before them. This *going before*, moreover, points already by anticipation to Him who is the one great leader, in the full sense of the word; just

[1] It may be thought better, with Lücke and Baumgarten-Crusius, to say, that *each* individual shepherd distinguishes his own division of the congregation of folds under many shepherds. But however true to the figure this may be, the Lord does not pursue it so far, but adheres in His whole description to the one, true Shepherd.

as the *knowing the voice* reverts to ch. viii. 43. In relation to this, Oetinger (in his Evangelien-Predigten S. 365) remarks that the voice of the true Shepherd, which is heard in every one of His servants, is no uncertain sound, but brings its clear evidence. We fully admit this, and add that it brings its full power also, so that sincere souls perceive by their understanding, on the one hand, the rational evidence of fundamental truth, and, on the other, feel in their hearts the experimental and quickening power of the word. Both are strictly connected; indeed, the latter, in many cases, predominates in the instinct of the sheep, not yet developed into full intelligence. And this may be the true point of distinction between the hearing of the voice by all, and the understanding of the name given by the better trained. Let me be pardoned for saying that this παροιμία, this εἰδύλλιον of the kingdom of God, is itself like a solemn and earnest melody played upon the shepherd's pipe, and cannot be fundamentally understood without something resembling a "playing" upon itself.

Ver. 5. The *stranger* is an immediate transition from the οἴδασι to which it is linked. The same no-shepherd and intruder is thus indicated who was before named a thief and a robber; but he is thus differently described in order that his various methods and degrees may be observed. Ver. 1 laid down the principle in its generality, that in his true character, as the Ἀμὴν Ἀμήν impressively aims to show, *every one* falls under this judgment who enters not by the door; but the ἀλλότριος now more definitely states this, and under two aspects. In severity—And this thief would pass himself off as the shepherd, *calleth* also the sheep. More gently—Or he knows not that his presumed pastoral care is in reality a robbery and destruction, he regards himself in judicial blindness as a shepherd, without any deliberate and intentional malice in his coming. This is as the *hireling* appears afterwards, although more gently regarded. The plural τῶν ἀλλοτρίων seems to indicate such variety in the cases, while the singular τὴν φωνήν combines them all again. It is as if the Lord would say:—"Are ye *strangers*, unauthorised ones, not conscious of the false basis on which your office rests, to wit, that ye come not through the door—then mark it in the *result:* do ye reach the simple souls, who are

God's true Israelites? Are ye known and acknowledged by these *true sheep*, with whom your office should have to do?" Casting our glance forward into Christendom, we find here once more (as in Matt. xviii. 17–20), in the words of our Lord, the deep-laid principles of the Apostolical, now called Presbyterian, constitution of the church. The flock must be asked—Wilt thou have this shepherd? But it must be the true flock, and not the mass. Yea, the door-keeping Spirit of the Church, who watches over, not only the entrance into office generally, but the special entrance into hearts also, must be the supreme arbiter of the Shepherd's voice. Oh that some of our ordained and inducted pastors would press the inference upon their consciences —The sheep know me not, then am I not yet rightly ordained and installed! But how is he, a stranger, to know the sheep, as *bonâ, i.e. malâ fide pastor*, and detect their "protest" in the midst of the goats' uproar of *applause*, who welcome every release from the fold? The true sheep will not fail to announce themselves! Even in the most wicked time (such as this to which our Lord refers), there will not be wanting a blind man restored to sight who will oppose the proud "*we* know" with his "one thing *I* know!" What this case exemplified, and ver. 8 shows to have taken place in the past history of Israel, the Lord predicts as an invariable rule for all futurity—*οὐ μὴ ἀκολουθήσωσιν*,[1] *ἀλλὰ φεύξονται*—as Lücke says, they will not indeed follow, but certainly flee! The latter strengthens the former; if the strange voice persists to call, it terrifies them altogether away. So that this *fleeing* from the stranger is not only permitted as conformable to nature, but it is commanded and ever made a mark of the sheep. The patient, helpless sheep *do* nothing more to the intruder; but they reserve themselves for the true Shepherd, and wait for Him, till He comes to investigate all.

The parenthetical observation of the Evangelist, ver. 6, is to be understood and modified in the same way as ch. viii. 27. That He meant concerning them what He spake *to them*, they failed not to observe; but because they would not, they did not

[1] Lachmann *ἀκολουθήσουσιν*, which, however, betrays itself as a correction.

fully *perceive* or *understand* τίνα ἦν. It was to them as if spoken ἐν παροιμίαις, ch. xvi. 25. As it regards the current assertion that St John here calls παροιμία, what the Synoptics term παραβολή, it is not, despite its universality, strictly true. True it certainly is that the hellenistic phrase for מָשָׁל does not always rigidly distinguish these two synonyms (they occur together Ecclus. xlvii. 17); hence we find, Lu. iv. 23, παραβολή employed for a single proverb. And there is a natural reason for this, the figure and comparison being common to both (Nonnus has here ἔπος πᾶράτροπον); and proverbial language, including the illustration of universal truth by an individual type, has ever for its foundation figure and comparison. Yet we doubt very much whether St John would have given the name παροιμίας to such παραβολάς as the Synoptics record, if he had narrated them. The difference between the two is not to be so rigidly pressed as it is by Quinctilian or Erasmus; for orators and poets may use transitional forms, just as living nature exhibits them, which defy the elaborate systematising of theory, but do not disturb the true and real distinctions which exist. The discourse of our Lord on the shepherd and the flock would then have been only a *parable*, in the established sense of that word as the other three Evangelists have exhibited it, if it had run in continuous narrative :—there were certain sheep in a fold, and thieves and strangers came,—then came the true shepherd—and when the wolf broke in, he laid down his life, and so forth. The *mere* παροιμία, sharply defined, we have in Matt. ix. 36; here it is the simple foundation of the similitude—the shepherd and his sheep. But this foundation of proverb is, to say the least, so amplified after the manner of a parable that a continuous narrative is silently intimated; and thus we have a medium between parable and proverb of profound and manifold significance which may serve as a storehouse of materials for many parables. St John, therefore, does not term it simply παραβολή, but an amplified παροιμία. And even the παραβολαί of the Synoptics so far approximate to this intermediate character, as that they often exhibit, not single and definite narratives, but figurative sketches of what is occurring at various times and in various ways. See my Exposition of Matt. xx. 1–16, Vol. iii.

Ver. 7. We find the same feature here, as we have seen in

the parables: the Lord sets out with explaining the similitude which was not understood, in its fundamental and starting point —What is then the *door?* He does not, however, adhere to a simple interpretation, but develops and continues the figure. The assertion that a new similitude, without any connection with the former, is now to be expounded, plainly contradicts the ἐγώ εἰμι of vers. 7, 9, 11, 14. The Lord speaks now more plainly, because they would not understand. He terms Himself *the* door, not one of many through which men as shepherds may reach the sheep; and thus progressively deepens the first meaning of ver. 1, as we said before. Entrance into the fold, and such office in it as had been well-grounded and justified in its results, had from the beginning been through Him alone; for He, as the Chief-Shepherd of His people and Angel of the covenant even before His coming in the flesh; as the Perfecter of all fruit-bearing influence and object of all true faith and faithful teaching; as the future Messiah, in whom the God of Israel reveals Himself; He and He alone *had been* this door *to the sheep*, even as He *is* ever such under the more plainly revealed new covenant. But this obvious sense has not given satisfaction; and many, because in ver. 9 ἡ θύρα stands absolutely, have denied it altogether, and substituted—I am the door *for* the sheep,[1] thus translating τῶν προβάτων ver. 7. And what shall we say of this? Assuredly the Lord is, generally (according to ch. xiv. 6), the θύρα τοῦ πατρός, the accessus ad Patrem, and also the ὁδὸς or θύρα τῆς ζωῆς, but does He include this in His meaning here? It is, indeed, to be subordinately understood, but not as the direct meaning; and thus, as Tholuck sees, we must resolve the strife for a one-sided exposition. In vers. 7, 8, He terms Himself, conformably with the figure, the door to the sheep, through which the shepherds must come to them; in ver. 9 He extends the idea of the θύρα, so that shepherds and sheep alike must *go in and out*, finding pasture for themselves and others, only through

[1] Thus Van Ess briefly, and Seiler by paraphrase—through which the sheep enter in. Thus Chrysostom, Augustine, Euthymius, Nonnus (πάνδοκος εἰμὶ θύρη προβάτων πολυχανδέος αὐλῆς), Maldonatus, Lampe, and recently Fritzsche. Steinmeyer preaches upon it—Christ is the door to *glory*, which is, in any view, one-sided and artificial, for the fold and the pasture are certainly not first in heaven.

Him; in ver. 11 this entrance effected by Him into salvation and peace, life and abundance for all, is stated of itself and independently. Let this deepening development be well understood, as our summary exhibited it at first; the second *follows from* the first, and the *door* thus becomes evidently the one, and only *Shepherd*.[1]

Ver. 8. Our preliminary glance showed how we dealt with that much-contested exegetical problem, the interpretation of πρὸ ἐμοῦ.[2] Certainly all who lay any stress upon internal criticism and the unity of connection, should be agreed in discerning in this expression an antithesis to δι' ἐμοῦ, ver. 9, or, what is equally incontestable, to διὰ τῆς θύρας, ver. 1. Any other sense must necessarily be wrong. Kling is quite correct in affirming that the mere idea of time, *ante me* (that is, before I came!), disturbs the whole figure, because it effaces all reference to the door.[3] We must add that this interferes with the relation of the whole discourse to the *future* church of Christ, which is as much contemplated in prospect, as Israel's past is viewed in retrospect. (A point of view for the whole, which, as far as we know, Herder alone has done justice to.) The thieves and robbers come as certainly *after* Christ as *before* Him. Consequently, we cannot concur with the common meaning of πρό; and the many qualifications of it fail to stand the test, since the Lord does not surely intend to reject *all* the teachers and guides of the people who came before His own appearing.[4] It is manifestly false to lay stress upon the ἦλθον, making it bear the meaning of a self-authorised coming,[5]

[1] As Neander also admits—the door of the penfold in a twofold sense, for the sheep and for the shepherds. So that He Himself is the *door*, and this distinguishes the true Shepherd κατ' ἐξοχήν. This is not "obscurity" (as de Wette protests), but profundity.

[2] The reading which omits it has no value, evidently only leaving out a difficulty. Yet Roos lays hold of this, and thinks that Jesus having said "All that ever came!" reserved the conclusion in His own mind, which, however, may be easily understood.

[3] Steinmeyer:—that we are not to think of the mere process of time, the last Prophet has most plainly told us, ch. i. 15, 27.

[4] As Marcion, and such as he, apply it.

[5] As Euthymius, Jerome, Theophylact. This last says:—Πρόσχες καὶ τῇ ἀκριβείᾳ τῆς λέξεως· ὅσοι ἦλθον φησίν, ἀλλ' οὐχ ὅσοι ἀπεστάλησαν. Steinmeyer concisely explains it that to come *before* Jesus is to come in their

for Jesus uses the same ἦλθον in ver. 10. Concerning Himself, consequently, it is not in this word, but in the πρὸ ἐμοῦ that we must seek their error. To understand both, when united, as intimating that all are referred to who had ever made themselves Messiahs, or had given themselves out to be the door, is to contradict the expression itself as well as all history.[1] Their history knew not any pseudo-christs in number sufficient to be spoken of as πάντες ὅσοι, nor can this limitation be established in the connection of the words; so that our most recent and unfriendly critics are obliged to impute this to St John as an anachronism. "They are not true and false Messiahs who are spoken of, but true and false pastors of souls." (Ebrard.) The Lord is dealing with false and corrupt shepherds! If this is admitted, then can the *ante me* be maintained only by restricting the whole question to the time of our Lord—all who have come recently, and just before Myself.[2] We are told that "Jesus might say this, generally, of the Pharisees of His time"—namely, that they were thieves and robbers. But we cannot think that the Lord would have used words so liable to be misunderstood as πάντες ὅσοι, when there were some exceptions, however few; besides which He Himself admitted in vers. 1–5 that there had been, and still were, true shepherds who entered in at the door. Thus ἦλθον is not to be pressed down to a *tempus præteritum proximum*, for it belongs to the interpretation of the preceding figure, which embraces all time in its application. And certainly, to supply a restricting and damaging clause, as Nonnus does—πάντες ὅσοι πάρος ἦλθον ὑποκλέπτοντι πεδίλῳ, is altogether inadmissible. We are thus shut up to one exposition of the preposition which enters into the spirit of the whole *figure*. Now it is evident, first,

own name, to come *after* Jesus is to testify of Him, to prepare His way, and engage in His service; but we may reasonably ask—how does this appear?

[1] Although F. J. M. Helferich, in his Predigten S. 364, repeats this after antiquity.

[2] Bengel artificially pressed the εἰσί into this service, and thought:—verbum subsequens, εἰσί, *sunt*, in præsenti, indicat, ἦλθον, venerunt, accipiendum esse de tempore præterito proximo. Lücke adheres to this, without naming Bengel (which he seldom does); and Ebrard follows in the same track: "Jesus terms Himself *the first (of His time)*, who truly cared for the common people."

that ἐμοῦ is equivalent to τῆς θύρας, for this follows from the δι' ἐμοῦ: consequently for our *interpretation* πρὸ ἐμοῦ is perfectly equivalent to πρὸ τῆς θύρας. But what does it mean, to come *before* the door, *in sensu temporis*? This has seemed to many unintelligible, and they have therefore preferred to render it—"pass *by* the door," thus making πρό bear the sense of præter, beside, daneben, ἀλλαχόθεν. (Camerarius—qui ostium vitant.) But this cannot be accepted, at least in this form; nor is "instead" better, as Lampe, Wolle, Wolf, Tittmann, Schleusner assert, corroborating it by Euripides.[1] A certain combination of the two, indeed, will not be found altogether groundless by those who know how to appreciate the force and fulness of meaning which, in the original construction of language, belongs to the *prepositions*,—a domain of inquiry not sufficiently cultivated by our philology, which is too micrological and forgets the philosophy of language.[2] The original unity of *vor* and *für* in the German [*before* and *instead of*] should teach us to regard a precipitate, self-obtruding "instead" as possibly involved in the πρό; and, in this sense, Jno. v. 7 has been appealed to,—"another steppeth in before me, instead of me, *pushing me aside*."[3] The language would, generally speaking, allow this: but then we should be brought to the false Messiahs, which cannot be admitted; and, further, the living person of Christ would be too directly substituted for the door, thus too abruptly losing sight of the figure. If the Lord were speaking merely of *Himself* without similitude, this would give a pregnant meaning:—the shepherd must enter in as following Me (Jer. xvii. 16, רֹאֶה אַחֲרֶיךָ), not before Me, that is, not push his way in without Me or altogether instead of Me. But we maintain that ἐμοῦ must perfectly coincide with θύρας; the *door*, however, does not *come* (so that it

[1] So the Hirschb. Bible, though hesitatingly: "passing by Me, yea, taking My place." So Lange, also; but see afterwards.

[2] Olshausen is not right in saying that this meaning of the preposition has been abundantly refuted. We shall bring some evidence from the context.

[3] So Lange: "who came not as My forerunners, but as superseding Me, into the fold." So Kling: "going before Him, they obtruded themselves into this territory"—while men should follow Him as the *living* and *moving* θύρα.

is not to be filled up by—"before I came or come"), but Christ was the door of all the shepherds, appointed and really such long before *His own* actual coming. We must not too much restrict the many-sided development of this figurative discourse, and confound too hastily the shepherd of ver. 11 with the door as such.[1] It is, indeed, true that *πρὸ sensu loci*, לִפְנֵי or עַל פְּנֵי, may pass over into a *præ* or *præter*. And for this we might appeal to the עַל פְּנֵי of the first commandment, Ex. xx. 2, Sept. *πλήν*, Onkelos בַּר מִנִּי, Luther *neben mir*,—and to Gesenius' de præstantiâ, præ, cf. Deut xxi. 16. But to apply this meaning *here* would be to abandon the figure of the door, and to think only of the Lord Himself, before whose view those who came would make themselves as great as, or greater than Himself!—What then is the truth, after all this refutation? Our view and translation holds somewhat with that of Camerarius—qui ostium vitant, and takes the *præter* as *beside* or *ἀλλαχόθεν*; but also with that of Elsner—*ante* januam. We think that *ἦλθον πρὸ τῆς θύρας* does not mean—"they went by or passed *beside* the door:" nor—"ante januam *abierunt*," since the *ἔρχεσθαι* is not a going away, but a *going in*. What is it then? They went in, *before they came to the door*. They broke in *precipitately and prematurely*, just as thieves and robbers do, *before they had taken time even to seek the door*.[2] For this they sedulously avoid, on account of the vigilant porter! We must leave it to the judgment of the reader, whether this may be *πρὸ τῆς θύρας*, and, figure and interpretation running into one, *πρὸ ἐμοῦ*; to us it appears plainly conformable both to the word and the matter, though certainly very concise. If we are disposed *now* to make prominent the emphatic *ἐμοῦ*, it would be,—"Before they sought and found Me *as* the door, *before* they came *to Me* in order to enter *by Me*," which would then be the counterpart of that other,—Before I came into the world or to them.[3] And we think that this alone

[1] This is seen in the *mystical* interpretations given by some:—They who came before Me, that is, before I came to them and into them, before My inspiring influence took possession of them.

[2] Here we are at one with von Gerlach. "This difficult expression is best explained in closest connection with the *figure*:—If any man leaps into the penfold, before he comes to the door, before the door."

[3] This expression is one of the hardest problems for our revisal of the

is the true sense of πρὸ ἐμοῦ, as it makes the Lord the door for all past time; for the ἐγώ εἰμι embraces the whole of this time past, just as in the parable of vers. 1–5. To it corresponds, by a similar presentation of the great historical figure, the εἰσί in the case of the thieves, as is shown by the ἤκουσαν with which it is interchanged.

This fact, that the *true* sheep never belonged to the false shepherds, never gave heed to their voice, was by no means true merely of the time of Christ, but is attested throughout the whole history of the flock and fold of God. Lücke understands no more than that "the people in general were susceptible to the voice of the Lord;" but this itself we very much doubt, nor can we understand how the people in general were so hostile to the Pharisees, fleeing from them, and not acknowledging them.[1] *The sheep*, as we have already shown, are by no means "the people in general," but those sincere and guileless souls who had ever known the voice of the Lord, the true Shepherd; the children of God already in Israel, even as the same expression is used in ch. xi. 52, prospectively concerning the Gentiles, susceptible of faith.[2]

Ver. 9. Now first, as has been said, the meaning of the figure "the door" extends or rather deepens into an almost identity with "the way" of ch. xiv. 6. Yet only almost, since here it is not so much the access to the Father, as obviously to the pasturage of life, to salvation. Kling's protest against Olshausen is too harsh, since the latter only fails to exhibit clearly what he really means. In this parabolical discourse, which moves freely

popular German translation. If the easily misunderstood *vor mir* must not remain, that no common reader may understand it of time; and if a parenthetical explanation (nicht durch mich) is not allowable; nothing remains but the terse and too concise *mir voraus* gekommen, that is, not waiting for Me, precipitate and rash, before they came to the *door*.

[1] Sepp maintains "that the people's respect for the priesthood at that time had entirely departed"—but the entire history of the Gospels shows the reverse! Jno. vii. 26; Acts iii. 17.

[2] Steinmeyer misses his way here, understanding by the sheep the people at large:—To follow, without joy or approbation, but with the secret sting of conscience, and with a perpetual protest in their hearts, was not *obedience!* Compare the very different teaching of Rom. ii. 8, vi. 16.

and livingly from one to another figure, there are two bye-paths of exposition which must be avoided. We must not prematurely let go the figure, and press onwards at the wrong place to the thing signified; nor must we too one-sidedly restrict the many-sided application of the figure itself. The solution of the difficulty of the ninth verse lies in this, that every other (under) shepherd besides the One, through whom as the door he must enter, is himself a sheep, and when he becomes a shepherd, is such only as one of the flock going before the rest. (As in Acts xx. 28, by the ἐν ᾧ, *in the midst of* which and not *over* which, the overseers appointed by the Holy Ghost are made one with the flock.) *This* thought forms the process of transition to a generalisation of the whole, so that He who is the door now appears as the one sole Shepherd of all the pastors with their flocks.[1] As Erasmus hit the meaning well: non est salutaris aditus in ecclesiam, nisi per me, sive pastor esse velis, sive ovis; similarly Hess expresses himself (though prematurely on ver. 7). No man can enter, whether as shepherd or sheep, but by Me. The transition to this extension of the subject is indicated in a threefold progression:—by the indefinite ἐάν τις which only seemingly applies to the shepherd as shepherd; by the σωθήσεται which at once makes him one with the sheep, and finally, and most plainly, by the *going out and finding pasture* which is added to the going in. Thus, the going in and out *here* is *not merely* the proverbial בּוֹא וָצֵאת of Deut. xxviii. 6, Ps. cxxi. 8, which indicates secure walking, living, and working (though connected with that), but (just as in Num. xxvii. 17, 21, this is applied to the pastor's office) the leading out of the flock after the entrance in such wise as that the shepherd himself belongs to the flock. Thus the νομὴν εὑρίσκειν, which is parallel with the σώζεσθαι, is not merely the "official blessing," though Lücke compares 1 Cor. iii. 15, which, however, does not apply its σωθήσεται merely to office; but he shall find pasture for himself and the sheep, he shall save himself and them that hear him. (1 Tim. iv. 16.)

[1] These "subordinate ideas" (rather *fundamental* ideas) lie not beyond the range of the parable, as Lücke says, but essentially *within it.* Cannot the door in the midst be regarded, in the actual figure, as the passage for the sheep to their pasture?

Ver. 10. We have already seen that thief and stranger were fundamentally one, though not absolutely the same; just so is it now, when *the thief* (we must add in thought—and robber) recurs in the original antithesis with which the discourse set out, though it now proceeds further to speak of the hireling and the wolf. See the analysis already given. The article in ὁ κλέπτης primarily belongs to the parable; but, inasmuch as the unity of the contrast is by it more impressively exhibited (One true Shepherd, ver. 11, and, opposed to Him, One thief), it already contains a transition to a plain disclosure of the deepest mystery of the matter. As in all the shepherds the One Shepherd is manifested, whether as represented by them or approving in them His presence and work, so also the manifold thieves are only types and ministers of *the* thief and murderer, whom we already forecast in these words! Those who are termed in Jer. xxiii. 1 מְאַבְּדִים וּמְפִיצִים have no other *design* than that of selfishness: and here we have the ἵνα κλέψῃ immediately following upon the κλέπτης. But they are not content with the milk and the wool, they desire *to feed themselves*, to eat the fat and to kill them that are fed (Ezek. xxxiv. 2, 3)—and with this the whole shepherd-figure suddenly finishes its exhibition from common life, and as the *tertium comparationis* the affectionate *shepherd-feeling* which cares alone for the sheep, remains. This brings out the touching analogy of man's protecting and solicitous love for the lower creation, as it reflects the pastoral love of Jesus, the highest expression of the loving-kindness of God. Yet the common shepherd of ordinary life will in the end partake of his slaughtered sheep: and this is the ground for the charge in this insufficient similitude,—Such shepherds are not shepherds, but thieves for themselves! Thus the θύσῃ follows quite naturally. But are we to take the ἀπολέσῃ which is added, with Bengel, as referring to the destruction of the pasturage? (In which sense it should contrast with the περισσὸν ἔχειν.) We think not, for the poor sheep remain the only object; and the περισσόν belongs to the ζωή, since the life-*giving* pasturage, which is one with life itself, is spoken of. Thus the *destroying* strengthens the killing; not merely exhibits it as loveless cruelty, but passes over into the disclosure of the wolfish mind in the thief, who finds his sole pleasure in killing! Baum.-Crusius distinguishes

rightly "they kill for their own gain, *and* only for the sake of killing." The best translation would be—*kill* and *murder;* both together being the יַחְרְגֵן of Zech. xi. 5. History shows that the selfishness of all self-feeding pastors has deepened into such a malicious and destructive spirit; even as that was in the beginning the ground of all selfishness.

And now comes the plain impressive antithesis of ἐγὼ ἦλθον—One alone has *life*, in its most essential sense, to bring and to give, and that is He! The *two words* ζωή and περισσόν, with the emphatically repeated ἔχωσιν include the whole fulness of all the good which we have in Jesus Christ. (Philem. 6.) In order that ζωὴν ἔχειν may not be taken too limitedly, or in a negative sense alone—continue to live and not be destroyed,—the second expression immediately follows. Only where *the Lord* is Himself the Shepherd, does the self-evident conclusion follow—I shall want *nothing* (Ps. xxiii.), thus Jesus here arrogates to Himself a Divine power, and all-sufficiency; but the positive expression περισσὸν ἔχειν (which Luther has, unhappily, somewhat enfeebled by "volle Genüge") oversteps the Old Testament לֹא אֶחְסַר, is even more than Jer. xxxi. 14. (The *fulness* of My gifts, yet in Heb. only אֶת־טוּבִי יִשְׂבָּעוּ, *enough.*)

Vers. 11–13. The rendering "*a* good Shepherd" in our ecclesiastical translation is only to be lamented and corrected. The article, with its emphatic repetition, is *primarily* generic, and, as belonging to the parable, intimates—a Shepherd, such as He should be, the ideal of all shepherds (καλός being almost tantamount to ἀληθινός), in contrast to all false and wicked shepherds, down to him who feeds his flock in hell; see Ps. xlix. 15, according to our commentary. But Israel had been already prepared for this great shepherd-figure; a Shepherd, *who should come*, had been fore-announced; and we will not argue with those who would deny a reference in the word of Jesus to that prediction. From the time when the shepherd Jacob spake the words of Gen. xlviii. 15 throughout the entire Old Testament, the Lord God is exhibited as Himself the Shepherd and Keeper of His chosen, His people—Ps. lxxx. 2, c. 3, xcv. 7, lxxiv. 1, lxxvii. 21, lxxviii. 52; Isa. lxiii. 11; Ecclus. xviii. 13. But when the Messianic Future comes into view, it is promised that the Lord will come and

gather His flock around Himself—Ezek. xxxiv. 11–16; Isa. xl. 11. Hence the Messiah, the servant David, is also called a Shepherd (Ezek. xxxiv. 23, xxxvii. 24). This is one of the most gracious among the names which the Scriptures give to the Lord Jesus;[1] and the early church, as is well known, took peculiar delight in representations of this figure.—The following clause, as a transition to the plain statement and interpretation, must be understood in a twofold sense. If He says, as a general declaration, that a good shepherd, or every good shepherd, gives up his life for the sheep (see 1 Sam. xvii. 34, 35)—yet does this great word assuredly pass over into the *prediction* which presently in ver. 15 stands alone; more especially, as the ἐγὼ ἦλθον and ἐγώ εἰμι had already preceded. Bengel rightly observes that in this last and highest expression of self-devotement, all else that belongs to the shepherd-feeling is involved and embraced—*So dear are they to Him!* Most perfect antithesis of the killing and destroying in ver. 10:—He dies Himself, rather than allow them to die, or become a prey to the wolf! And in this the vicarious sense of ὑπέρ is already prepared for and actually included, though assuredly not in the juridico-dogmatical meaning. The formula, peculiar to St John, ψυχὴν τιθέναι (see, upon this, Lücke), finds no perfect analogy either in classical Greek or in the Septuagint: for it is neither the Homeric παρατίθεσθαι, nor the Latin *animam deponere* in Corn. Nep., *ponere* in Propert. *spiritum deponere* in Valer. Max., or Cicero's *ponere vitam;* nor is it even the Heb. שׂוּם נֶפֶשׁ בְּכַּת, τιθέναι ἐν χειρί, though this is connected with it. It proceeds certainly from "a laying aside or laying down," hence in ver. 18 the taking again corresponds; but to go no further than this (with Lücke, who even compares the laying aside and taking again of the garments, ch. xiii. 4, 12) is quite out of the question, as it would most unseasonably weaken the emphasis of the offering of His life. Thus the laying down is rather a casting away, a voluntary devotion of the life; or, as we might properly substitute—a *venturing* or *staking* life for the salvation and deliverance of the sheep. This deepening of the meaning follows from the closely connected ὑπέρ; and Isa.

[1] As they are given, with almost too great fulness, in A. H. Francke's Christus der Kern heiliger Schrift, § 64.

liii. 10[1] is a correct parallel, although we cannot certainly say that the Lord directly referred to it. And the Peschito has here the same word, נַפְשֵׁה סַאִם, also translating ὑπὲρ by חֵלֹת —*instead*, as Matt. ii. 22.

Döpke quotes from the Bava Mezia fol. 93. col. 2. fol. 106. col. 1 a similar parable concerning a *hireling* who left the sheep in peril, in contrast with Moses, who, according to Ex. xxxii. 32 offered his own life for the sheep, Jalkut Rubeni fol. 108. col. 3. We need no such parallels to help our understanding of our Lord's words, as they spring out of the matter which He speaks of. He *extends* now finally the contrast of those who are not shepherds in such a manner as to include all, and even the best are now set over against the true Shepherd; the *shepherd-love* is distinguished as a great characteristic from everything in common life. The *strangers*, who call like the shepherds, were, above, the beginning of this transition; but now, every *μισθωτός*, hired servant, who exercises the office of shepherd for wages from the Lord of the sheep, is even as a stranger:—*he is not a shepherd*, although so called, and, in ordinary life, rightly so. It is not to be forgotten, that in ancient times even rich proprietors of large flocks were themselves pastors of their flocks, yet, of course, needed under-shepherds too; and these latter *might* and *ought*, with true shepherd feeling, to take care of the flocks for their master as if they were their own. But the *parabolical* idea of the hired servant passes over into that of the mercenary, as in ver. 13—*ὅτι μισθωτός ἐστι* in the true, and worse sense of the word! By this it is not said that every under-shepherd, serving for proper and necessary wages, must have in his heart an *οὐ μέλει αὐτῷ περὶ τῶν προβάτων*; but, in the spiritual and deep apprehension of all these relations, it is intended to be said—that a servant, who loves the sheep as his own (here, at the same time, feels himself related to the sheep) is essentially the *shepherd;* while, on the other hand, the *lords* or possessors of the sheep (קוֹנֵיהֶן, Zech. xi. 5) by false dominion alone will kill and destroy them. Finally, in the issue, as the

[1] Altogether missed by the LXX. The תָּשִׂים is not the second person, but נַפְשׁוֹ is a significant nominative and accusative at once, in order strongly to emphasise voluntary self-consecration. Even Rosenmüller resolves it into—אם נַפְשׁוֹ תָּשִׂים נפשׁוֹ.

Lord will correctly assign everything its place in the *interpretation*, the *hireling* is not altogether or from the beginning a stranger; for the door is open to him, the sheep flee not from him, he has led them forth and protected them until—*the wolf cometh.* Then, indeed, when the fearful cry, well known in shepherd-fables, is heard, or when, as here, he *seeth* the wolf—the test is applied which finally distinguishes between shepherd and not-shepherd, in the keen and penetrating sense of this παροιμία. He who had hitherto protected them, now *leaveth* the sheep, which fly not from him, but rather fly in tumultuous fear to him for protection;—but he, οὐκ ὢν ποιμήν, *fleeth* himself, and prefers to sacrifice the life of the sheep rather than his own. Thus is the hireling such an one as "without any evil intention, but also without any love, does the work of a shepherd." (B.-Crusius.) He is, or appears to be, at first better than a stranger—but when the test is applied, the "evil design" of selfishness becomes manifest, and he *leaveth* the sheep at last to the essential *robber of the fold.*[1]

And that is the *Wolf* in a pre-eminent and fearful sense! We find, in Acts xx. 29, and Matt. vii. 75, *wolves* mentioned and men meant (comp. Zeph. iii. 3),—but such in this parable were the thieves and robbers; the wolf here is beyond the circle of evil shepherds, he is the perfect antithesis of Christ, the one good shepherd; consequently, he is a personality opposed to His,—*the great enemy!* Not merely "every enemy of the theocracy"—to establish which Lücke resorts to a most inappropriate abstraction, "the testing danger, every anti-theocratical power," finding no trace of the Devil here. We, for our own part, regard all abstraction as contrary to the spirit of the living figure, and plainly *see*, in the whole process of the parable, in which the sheep from the beginning are exhibited as needing protection against the wolf, this great robber of the fold *coming.* Lampe opposes this interpretation, on the ground that the ignorant hireling could not know and see that it was the wolf of hell coming—but this might be regarded as questionable in many cases in the application, and, furthermore, the similitude is not

[1] What Klee adduces from Augustin, S. 282, in favour of the hireling, does not fit the circle of ideas in this similitude.

to be too literally pressed. To the eyes of the hireling it may appear often to be "dangers" and "persecutions" simply, but the Lord, speaking of them, names the wolf alone whom every one ought to be supposed to know who would assume to be a shepherd. *To this point* tended the second description of the thief in ver. 10, so that we may carry our interpretation a little deeper:—the wolf is a thief, and every thief is already a wolf, like unto him as being his agent and confederate. And now comes the lamentable picture of a flock devoted to destruction: the wolf tears and eats what he can, the remaining sheep he at least *scatters*, so that the *flock* exists no more. Yea, still more, "the wolf is the most havoc-committing animal on earth; when he comes (fully) into a sheep-fold, he first bites all the sheep *to death*, and then begins to eat." (Herberger.) The infernal wolf, finally, has most insatiable jaws! And what of the hireling called shepherd? He fleeth, that he may not be also devoured, and says—*salvavi animam meam!* Properly speaking, he thus becomes himself a wolf after his kind.—Here the *parable* reaches its highest point, and breaks off; and the words which follow are in plain language. For as, in actual life, it can scarcely be regarded as absolutely *imperative* upon a shepherd to fight with the wolf, but rather, like the poor sheep themselves, to fly and save at least himself—so, in the interpretation, strictly speaking the stronger one alone can contend with the enemy. Even the best under-shepherd must often take care of himself, and commit the rest to the chief shepherd; he *can* do no more than in his strength sacrifice himself for the contest. So that everything drives us to the centre of the whole, to the ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ποιμήν.

Vers. 14, 15. The Lord still remains in the same similitude, in as far as He still speaks of shepherd and sheep; but the fundamental idea of the figure is already plainly brought out, and it is this—the mutual knowledge and the bond of love between the Shepherd and *His* sheep. Thus there is in the distinctive expression τὰ ἐμά the first plain indication that there are *false sheep*, as there are false shepherds; but *this* already passes beyond the circle of ideas hitherto contained in the parable. The discourse is not of merely *knowing* in the ordinary sense; we must not, however, be misled by the apparent contrast with οὐ μέλει into interpreting the γινώσκειν as if it meant "caring, protecting,

curare." This is not permitted (as Lücke remarks) by the evident connection with vers. 3, 4, and still less by the following καθὼς γινώσκει.[1] It is evident that this saying contains the essential theme of the whole discourse, and that as such it must be interpreted in the sense of 2 Tim. ii. 19. Yea, the Lord knoweth His own, and even before they know Him He sees in anticipation their faith and their following of Himself, and because He does see it He calls them; it follows from *His* knowing first that it can afterwards be said—γινώσκομαι ὑπὸ τῶν ἐμῶν, comp. 1 Cor. viii. 3; Gal. iv. 9.[2] The knowing is on His part the acknowledgment and acceptance of His love; on our part the consciousness of being loved awakening love in return. As the *Son of God*, which now must be spoken plainly out, Jesus knows and acknowledges His own; for He sees them coming, receives them and loves them as given to Him by the Father (ch. vi. 37)—yea, as the sheep of the Father, with whom He is one, see afterwards vers. 29, 30. We shall take occasion to consider, upon ch. xiv. 20, xv. 10, xvii. 8, 21, the profound sense in which our fellowship with Jesus is likened to His fellowship with the Father; Lu. xxii. 29 must be brought into the comparison, as also for the mutual γινώσκειν between the Father and the Son (Matt. xi. 27).

Therefore, because He, in the unity of the Father's love, loveth the objects of His redeeming grace, He layeth down His life for them! Again, *by this* is He known by His own to be the good Shepherd! This reciprocal meaning lies in the καί. Let the present τίθημι be well noted, spoken prophetically to the enemies who stood before Him ready to execute their purpose. Because His ψυχή, like His σάρξ, is life, the sheep should receive life from Him, strictly speaking, through His death; in the foundation of the ὑπέρ there lies the true substitution. The

[1] Can the Son be said to care for the Father? Hezel translates, "I care for the Father's honour, the fulfilment of His will!" Erasmus improperly severed ver. 15 from ver. 14—"as the Father knoweth Me, I know the Father!" To what purpose this aimless parenthesis? Still worse, in relation to ver. 15, is Semler's *probare* for γινώσκειν.

[2] Augustin: Aliquando se ipse nesciunt oves, sed pastor novit eas, secundum ipsam prædestinationem, secundum ipsam Dei præscientiam. The *aliquando* here says too little, the *prædestinatio* too much.

good Shepherd, become a Lamb, surrenders Himself to the will of the wolf, who cometh against Him in the person of the shepherds and sheep turned into wolves; and here He points to Isa. liii. 7, as well as to the scornful rejection of the good Shepherd in Zech. xi. 11–13. For *the* sheep:—these are, assuredly, *His own*, foreseen as such, for whom alone His death becomes actually available; this restriction, which before, in ver. 14, and after, in ver. 16, plainly recurs, cannot be done away with. (It has been said that now we do not find—*My* sheep, but—for all.) This sense is not open to any objection, any more than the περὶ πολλῶν of Matt. xxvi. 28, and the not praying for the world, Jno. xvii. 9. It does not gainsay the great fact, that in another and prior sense, He died for all the straying sheep. (Isa. liii. 6.)

Ver. 16. The prophecy stretches forward; its glance extends to the widest and largest range of view which belongs to the two great words "*Shepherd* and *fold*"—in order that from this elevation it may look down again, or rather descend to the depths of the foundation of this salvation, the death of the Son of God. Let it be observed, with what majestic clearness and fulness of comprehension the Lord adjusts, and arranges from beginning to end, the thoughts which shine through the figurative expressions of this discourse, which issue from the depths of the sacred anger and love of His shepherd-heart! The *prophecy* stretches forward; here, as elsewhere, the calling of the Gentiles is exhibited as the fruit and immediate consequence of the death of Jesus upon the cross. Not only in ch. xi. 52 does the Evangelist derive his perfectly parallel expression from this saying of our Lord; but the Lord Himself repeats the promise in the hearing of the Greeks (ch. xii. 32). Malicious hearers might have mockingly answered His beautiful words in ver. 14—"Yea, verily, Thy sheep are a wretched little company in the land;" and the Lord in His dignity anticipates and answers these thoughts. The *other* sheep are, assuredly, not (as Wolf and Paulus shortsightedly interpret) the Jewish *diaspora*; "*of*" this fold includes them already, as belonging to it, though not precisely in it; all Israelites regarded themselves as one great whole separated from the heathen. It appears to us probable that, *now* (it was too soon in connection with the ἐξάγει) the ἐκ gently indicates

that the *flock* of Jesus cannot, and should not remain in this *fold* (which indeed was broken up). Bengel's remark may be received with confidence. It does not say, "out of or in *another fold*,"[1] for the heathens who were to be called, although already foreseen τέκνα τοῦ θεοῦ, predisposed to faith, were nevertheless διεσκορπισμένα.[2]

The Saviour knows them, and *has* them already as His sheep, just as in Acts xviii. 10 He has already much people in Corinth. We see that the discourse remains throughout faithful to its original manner, which is, to enlarge and anew to interpret in succeeding words the sayings which had been already used; for here again the γινώσκω τὰ ἐμά is extended to apply to the foreknowing of all who *should* hear His voice, and to whom He Himself is not yet known. In Jer. xxiii. 3, and Micah ii. 12 (not to mention passages which contain the same figure, but not so plainly) a gathering together of the dispersed of Israel into one flock, and one fold, was promised; but this is here enlarged to embrace all the peoples of entire humanity, as in Ezek. xxxiv. 30, 31. That the Son of God will in due time construct, for the protection and government of these other sheep, an αὐλή, though not such as that in the Old Testament; yea, that this new fold is to be only the continuation and consummation of that already existing in the Old Testament,—is decisively declared in the ἀγαγεῖν, which Theophylact rightly explains by

[1] Although the Gentiles may be asserted to have been in some sense under a Divine "guidance," yet this did not place them in such a relation to the theocracy that they may be regarded as having been only in another fold:—"the great Proprietor of the flock having more than one αὐλή." Not a syllable of this is in the text. The emphasis must be made to lie upon *fold*—not out of this *fold;* not, as preachers are wont to say, out of *this* fold! Else how can we understand the *bringing?*

[2] The historically permanent *type* of this is the diaspora of the Jews; hence in the prophets the gathering together of the children of God is referred to by this expression. By an error of exposition, which cannot be too severely condemned, the great Schleiermacher (Homil. über John ii. 207) makes these *other* sheep *all* other men, and founds upon this passage the doctrine of universal restoration. And this, too, in connection with the following outrageous interpretation appended:—Because Jesus as the Son of man knoweth *all* men even as the Father knoweth Him, and not merely beholds all men as His own, but is (as being man) so one *with all men* as (in His higher nature) He is one with the Father!

συναγαγεῖν (Glassius: vel προσαγαγεῖν); for the authentic interpretation of St John himself, ch. xi. 52, runs—ἵνα συναγάγῃ εἰς ἕν. Lange's imagination plays him false when he says—In the *night time* of the Old Testament there was a fold, but afterwards in the *day* only a flock, no longer folded. Oh no, even the New Testament has its external Christendom, its outward exhibition of fellowship, its pastoral discipline and care. *But*, as soon as the New-Testament church[1] forgets its unaccomplished mission; and whenever an *individual interim-church* pharisaically stands alone in its exclusiveness, this utterance of the *great* Shepherd of *the* or of all sheep (Heb. xiii. 20) protests against it, testifying for ever against all bigoted arrogation to one fold of the privileges common to all—I have *other* sheep! perpetually crying, too, as an exhortation—them also I *must* bring in![2]

This is a *Must* resting upon the love of Him who has given His life for them—and in the unity of the Father, whose righteous love embraces the world, and all in it who should believe. The Lord speaks of what His Apostles and their successors do, as if it were done by Himself; the preached gospel is no other than *His* voice, specially for all who are actually sheep, who shall *hear* and understand the Shepherd's call. Great Missionary Promise, with which His servants may for ever confirm their confidence, and console their hearts, when met by unbelief, even as the Lord Himself does, ver. 26—They are not His sheep, even as He said. *One fold, one Shepherd*—the great conclusion of this παροιμία, itself a concentrated proverbial saying, but also formed upon the prophetic promise of the *one Shepherd*, Ezek. xxxiv. 23, xxxvii. 24; the latter of which passages had reference to the separation between Judah and Ephraim, ver. 22, as the *type* of all future divisions among the people of God. And the saying in Zech. xiv. 9 (which evidently has a yet wider range of meaning) may be compared

[1] Münchmeyer discerns here quite correctly a "polemic against Missions resting upon the basis of individual churches distinctively:"—the same may be found in my Keryktik, § 47 (especially in the second edition).

[2] To this point, that is, to church against church, we may refer the application of the incorrect emphasis—not of *this* fold! The Lord does by no means say, γενήσεται μία αὐλή—though the English translation characteristically enough confounds the distinction by its *one fold*.

with these. This promise begins in its internal truth to receive its fulfilment even in the New-Testament age; for the true sheep see and hear no longer every man in his own way, but all constitute, in separate folds, one great flock in one common pasture. But all demarcations are finally to fall away, when all are led to the living fountains of water in the new world; and one common eternal praise will redound to the *one Shepherd*, whose name alone worthily closes all. When the elect are gathered from the four winds; when the πλήρωμα τῶν ἐθνῶν has come in and Israel is restored; when the *scattering* of the not-destroyed sheep—the work of the wolf under a thousand forms—is turned into its glorious opposite; when the apostasy has driven the saints in united patience and love close around their saving and protecting Shepherd—then will there be a preparatory and still typical fulfilment of the great μία ποίμνη, εἷς ποιμήν. It does not merely intimate (though *primarily* it does) the union of Jews and Gentiles;[1] but the εἷς ἕν reaches to the full meaning of ch. xvii. 24.

Vers. 17, 18. With the last ποιμήν the λαλεῖν ἐν παροιμίαις altogether ceased, and He here already begins to speak to them plainly of *the Father*. The last and deepest ground in the Son Himself, which can be disclosed to us, is His relation to the Father, His subordination and His oneness, together and in concert; this mystery, indeed, which can be apprehended by us only in the words Father and Son, is itself in a certain sense a παραβολή. The Lord returns back to the central utterance of His shepherd-love, that by which His sheep in Israel should first come to a right knowledge of Him, and by which His sheep without should also in due time come to know Him—*I lay down My life!*[2] He at the same time sums up in one the two great truths which so marvellously follow one another in vers. 15 and 16, showing how their procedure is: I die and—I am still the good Shepherd, calling and bringing into the fold other sheep. Thus the solution is the death and resurrection of the

[1] Nonnus narrows his interpretation to this meaning alone:—καὶ μία ποίμνη ἔσσεται ἀμφοτέρωθεν ἑνὸς τελέθουσα νομῆος.

[2] Moreover, He had not previously said—I am the *great*, the only, the highest, the true Shepherd, or the like, but—the *good*, the true Shepherd, rightly qualified for the exercise of that office!

Son of God. The Father *loveth* Me—here is the true interpretation of the previous γινώσκει. But He loveth Me no otherwise than as the Father in His compassionate love to the world *not sparing* His own beloved Son, but *giving Me up.* We act in perfect union (We are one, ver. 30)—I gladly fulfil the good pleasure of the Father, for I in like voluntary compassion give up Myself. *Because of this,* even as in this and for this, the Father loveth Me! But now it must be understood that the Son of God, dying so wonderful a death, cannot Himself be holden of death (Acts ii. 24); that the Redeemer only submits to the enemy that He may thereby overcome him. Thus the ἵνα πάλιν λάβω, is most assuredly and essentially τελικόν, although many of the ancients scrupled at this;[1] see chap. xii. 24. Without the conscious design to overcome and redeem, the death of Christ would neither be permissible nor possible. Yea, we may truly assert "that to lay down life, *in order to* take it again,—is in an analogous sense the great work of the members, even as it was of the Head." Thus does the Lord remind us once more of His first word, chap. ii. 19. To those whose will is to, and who will, put Him to death, the Lord utters His prospective testimony—"I will give Myself up to your power according to the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God; I will not resist you." (Jas. v. 6.) With force and compulsion, admitting no possibility of His eluding or opposition, no one *taketh* (αἴρει) His life from Him:—neither man, nor angel, nor he who hath the power of death, the Prince of this world, who, indeed, even now hath nothing in this holy Son of man as such. He lays down and gives up His life with the most perfect voluntariness, and with the highest energy of doing in suffering; as is witnessed throughout from the falling backwards of those who would lay hands on Him in the garden (ch. xviii. 6) to that last παραθήσομαι τὸ πνεῦμά μου—now will I die! In this lies manifold evidence of the Divine power and dignity of this dying man; it is His indwelling ἐξουσία as the Son of God, to die and to live again, as He wills in the will of the Father.[2] The second Adam has

[1] Euthymius: δηλωτικὸν τοῦ πάντως ἐσομένου.

[2] B.-Crusius exhibits in his "may indeed" the repugnance of his conscience to the rationalism of his assertion—"ἐξουσία may indeed have in

as such in virtue of His sinlessness the *posse etiam non mori;* if besides this the Son of God in this humanity should die otherwise than voluntarily, in order to obtain life for Himself as the Head of many members, in His death there would be neither merit nor power of redemption, no cause for the love of the Father. Beck, christ. Lehrwissenschaft i. S. 513–517, speaks correctly and profoundly on this point.[1] This *commandment*, to lay down His life and *take* it again (from the Father's hand, but with His own), He received from the Father. (Ch. xiv. 31.) Without this obedience, it would not be the atoning and redeeming aid of the Son of God; but rather (to speak foolishly but with perfect truth) an unwarrantably offered, therefore not accepted, yea even sinful, offering for the sins of the world.

Finally, let us observe that no sooner has the Lord, in the highest climax of His consummated parable, assumed His supreme dignity and authority as the One Shepherd of all God's sheep to be gathered by Him into one, than He retreats and descends, with that *temperamentum majestatis et humilitatis* which is impressed upon all His sayings, into the *obedience* of the Father again. As He must, even in connection with this submission, maintain His own dignity and power in the mighty ἐξουσίαν ἔχειν over His death and His life,[2] He yet finally softens this again on the other side by the expression which is designedly emphatic, and—though in a different sense—alike true of His

the two following clauses a difference of meaning—My own power, and My conceded, permitted power!" That would be marvellous ἐξουσία, and it must then have run—καὶ ἐξουσίαν λήψομαι τοῦ λαβεῖν αὐτήν.

[1] Where he rightly explains (1 Pet. iii. 18), "We must not interpret θανατωθεὶς σαρκί—put to death *by* the flesh; and no more should we interpret ζωοποιηθεὶς τῷ πνεύματι—quickened by the Spirit, but *in the Spirit.* This quickening in the Spirit follows from the Divine power in the self-energy of Christ, even as the weakness which underlay the death of His body rests upon His *self-acquiescence.*"

[2] Here, as ever in the history of the Godman, we have the unity of things otherwise in opposition. "In other cases the *commandment* concerning a matter takes from him who receives it, the power over that matter; but in Jesus it was otherwise. He was at once Lord and Servant—one with the Father, and yet also obedient to the Father." (Roos.)

humanity and His Divinity, ἐντολὴν ἔλαβον—which therefore none should dare to explain away or impair.

AT THE FEAST OF THE DEDICATION. EXPLANATORY AND ENLARGED REPETITION OF THE FORMER TESTIMONY: I AND MY FATHER ARE ONE!

(Ch. x. 25–30.)

Though the intervening remarks of the Evangelist in vers. 19–21 especially indicate the conclusion and the result of what had previously transpired, yet they give to the ἐγένετο δὲ—καὶ περιεπάτει of vers. 22, 23, the tone of an immediate sequence and strict connection. And the substance of the new discourse, so closely consecutive as it is upon the former, confirms this impression. Thus it is impossible that the two months from Tisri to Kisleu, which intervened between the two feasts, or even a portion of that time, can be interjected here as having been spent by our Lord elsewhere than in Jerusalem. We cannot allow that He had entirely left Jerusalem, and, after many occurrences in Galilee during the interval, had returned to the feast of the Dedication. St John assuredly does not signify this, and it is his wont accurately to demarcate the Lord's visitations of the feasts. That system of harmony which assumes His departure and return, and interpolates here a whole synoptical section of "Christ's final residence in Galilee," outrages all exegetical feeling, and does violence to the words of the Evangelist.[1] Tho-

[1] How strikingly does it appear in Lange's words—"But John *transports us suddenly* into the midst of the Dedication-festival!" He says, indeed (III. 679), that my arguments to the contrary have not convinced him, and have not weakened the force of the opposite arguments. I have not expressly argued on the point, not writing a harmony; yet it appears to me that what I have said above is a strong argument—and not an *assertion* merely, as Lange says, asserting like myself. Even Neander admits that *if* we hold to the representation of John alone, we must accept the tarrying at Jerusalem; but this does not "preclude further inquiry of his own." But we follow the text of St John, though he is only kept in doubt by it.

luck, Olshausen, Lücke, Schleiermacher, all feel this in common, as Hess had before them, and adhere to Bengel's assumption, the only one which is reconcilable with the Scripture—that Jesus had *remained*, from the feast of Tabernacles to the feast of Dedication, in Jerusalem or in its near neighbourhood.[1] This gives us the longest residence of our Lord in Jerusalem, of which we have any account; and His persistent tarrying there is easily explicable as the final experiment of His love in persevering testimony against the enmity of the Jews. Very different from this, and indeed almost inconceivable to us, would have been a special return on occasion of this subordinate, modern, and little frequented feast. Certainly *this* would have been a very different case from the earlier visit to the highly esteemed feast of *Purim*, which, indeed, had its place in the Canon.

But we have already said that, as a departure and return cannot be interjected between vers. 21 and 22, so neither can the greater part of those two months. For the reference to the former discourse in vers. 26, 27 (whether καθὼς εἶπον ὑμῖν be genuine or not, it is there in effect) will not suit so long an interval: and it is more important to observe that, in St John's order of thought, ver. 24 depends upon ver. 19, so that the σχίσμα ἐν τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις gives the prospective motive for the urgent question of these same Ἰουδαῖοι originating in that division. Consequently, we must assume certain intervals in the section, chs. vii.–x., to be interposed at ch. ix. 8, 35, 39. This might have extended to weeks, while the impression of the miracle continued and increased, as we see that it did among the people; consequently, the first shepherd-discourse, as Bengel says, might very well fall in the middle of the interval between the two feasts, and then the connection of what follows is perfectly natural and obvious.

Instead of that *uniting in one* of the true people of God which had been predicted in ver. 16, as the consequence of hearing the voice of the Shepherd, a *division* arises among these *Jews* as the result of His word; for, they are not His sheep! A new evidence that this expression *does not always*, and does not here

[1] Thus we may see how the notice of ch. viii. 1, which it has been sought to make spurious, is confirmed as an intimation which extends to all these chapters.

and in ver. 24, designate simply the Rulers and Pharisees:—see also ch. vi. 41. There, as here, the word designates in its connection the whole of the people generally, in the widest sense.[1] *Once more* there is a division, as in chs. ix. 16 and vii. 43; but this time it arises upon His *sayings*, with which His works are then brought into comparison. The enemies are πολλοί, the well-affected are merely ἄλλοι. Unbelief repeats the only saying of ch. vii. 20, viii. 48; and we have already said that δαιμόνιον ἔχειν and μαίνεσθαι may be regarded here in their *difference* as well as being synonymous. Although the following—μὴ δαιμόνιον δύναται, may not (as Klee thinks) absolutely *prove* that the expression is used in its proper and essential sense, since the opposite view may cling tenaciously to the common usage of the time, yet is it obviously to be assumed that such is the case; and the argument that μαίνεσθαι must be in all cases regarded as the explanation of δαιμονίζεσθαι is much more certainly false.[2] Two things had especially offended His enemies in τοῖς λόγοις τούτοις:—the reference to the Gentiles, and the assumed prerogative to lay down, and take up, His life. At least it would seem that the final impression upon their minds resented rather what had just been spoken than the polemical attack upon the wicked shepherds which they had first heard. They do not only themselves recoil and turn away from what He uttered, but they demand of others also, that they should not continue to hear Him.[3] The commencing *faith* of these hearers, however, is not so easily cast down; it compares the words with the works; first appealing to the collected, composed, and calm testimony of the words themselves, and then to the concert and harmony between the works and the words, as furnishing additional evidence of the reasonableness and truth of the latter. They especially refer to the last great work performed on the blind man, but the plural τυφλῶν embraces all similar works

[1] Neander: It embraces under the common idea of Ἰουδαῖοι both the predominant party of Pharisees, and the multitudes from Galilee.

[2] "Else must all forms of speech, used out of their proper meaning, destroy the very ground from which they arose." Von Meyer in his Aufsatze von den Besessenen (Frankfurt 1812), S. 50—a treatise well worth reading.

[3] Strongly expressed by Nonnus:—Φθεγγόμενον βαλίῃσιν ἐάσατε τοῦτον ἄελλαις—ἄφρονα τοῦτον λείπετε.

which had preceded it. They who are *possessed* (not merely mad!) may do many things extraordinary, and out of the usual track of nature, but not anything benevolent or healing: to open the eyes of the blind is no work of the devil, but the work of God alone. (Ps. cxlvi. 8.)

In the midst, and during the progress, of this contest concerning Jesus, so exciting to the people, the feast of the *Dedication* came on, which—as we now well know—was a feast of more recent and human institution, to be traced up to 1 Macc. iv. 52–59; 2 Macc. x. 5–8. Thus we see the shadowy and dissembling devotion of these Jews to their theocratic feasts and festivals continuing ever to run parallel with their decline, apostasy, and unbelief! The good Shepherd, the Lord of the Temple soon to be desolate, remained there until then, and *walked* in it, seeking and waiting for any stray sheep that might hear His voice. Behold, I am with you yet!—thus did He by this walking present Himself to their acceptance. It was χειμών—this is hardly a mere chronological remark for foreigners, intimating that the feast fell during the winter; but it gives the reason why our Lord sought refuge in *Solomon's porch*:[1] it was winterly and foul weather, as in Matt. xvi. 3, xxiv. 20. Then *came round about* Him, urgent and pressing, the *Jews*, as it were holding Him fast (now must Thou answer us and abide the test!). These Jews are to be understood with the same generality as in ver. 19, a mingled multitude of Pharisees and common people, but now more especially the opposing party. To think of the leaders of the people taking Him aside in such a public place (as Lange seems to do) is to our mind quite inappropriate, and little in harmony with the general scene. Since chap. viii. 25 the urgent desire to hear the plain declaration—"I am Christ!" has gone so far, that they now utter it themselves as assumed by Him—*If* Thou art the Christ, tell us it out plainly and in literal words! The peculiar use of αἴρειν τὴν ψυχήν has something of obscurity in it, but the connection helps us to its right interpretation. We find it in Euthymius (equivalent to ἀναρτᾷν), and Grotius (equivalent to μετεωρίζειν)—thus μετέωρον ποιεῖν, dubium

[1] After the pattern of the old temple. It is quite uncertain whether the tradition is right which states it to have been a relic of the former temple of Solomon.

suspensumque animi tenere. This is quite in harmony with the fact and the phraseology, as our modern expositors acknowledge; Erasmus substituted "suspendis" for the indefinite "tollis" of the Vulg. De Wette opposes this (Stud. u. Krit. 1834. 4. 931) and reduces it to "excite us to *expectation*"—but this is a superfluous refinement and scruple. The straining their curiosity and expectation is, indeed, the predominant idea, but not as unconnected with uncertainty also. Lange interprets:—"how much they suffered under His mighty influence, while they were refusing to allow their souls to be *laid hold of* by Him"—and this is quite in accordance with his artificial application of the whole, of which more will be said hereafter.[1] For what is it that these people here desire? Are they disposed to believe, and do they use the words with a good meaning and in earnest? Then would the answer be very different. Moreover the decree of chap. ix. 22, had already been issued; and further proceedings against Himself were only suspended till they could provoke an express declaration from His lips—the only thing wanting. If He now acknowledged Himself to be the Christ—what then? The πιάζειν which follows, nevertheless, in ver. 39. The judicial investigation and condemnation of blasphemy, as in Matt. xxvi. 65. Lange's exposition, which regards the rulers of the people as making a final experiment to induce Him to declare Himself a Messiah in *their* sense, ready to be a new Judas Maccabæus against the power of the Romans, seems to us fitly to belong to his unexegetical Poesies.[2] We cannot allow even an

[1] It is incorrect to compare ἐπαίρειν, LXX. 2 Kings xviii. 29, for הִשִּׂיא (comp. Jer. xxxvii. 9) which the translators interchanged with הִשִּׂיא; for that does not (as Tholuck supposes) signify "to keep in suspense." The ὑποκλέπτειν of Nonnus pointed that way, but cannot be supported. And we must reject Bengel's (and Elsner's, whom Lücke refers to)—quamdiu nos (quasi) enecas, exanimas! Fikenscher indulges us with a curiosity of exposition—"αἴρειν τὴν ψυχήν *must* have the same meaning as ver. 18, *till when then wilt Thou take our life?* They in mockery termed Him, from His former words, the taker of life, and will have Him now predict to them till when He would cause them to remain in death—tell us plainly when we die that we may prepare accordingly! The εἶπον ὑμῖν of the answer suits this well." How far may well-meaning exposition wander!

[2] Lange's answer to this (iii. 649) is justly as severe as my words. But why exchange compliments, when the unity of the faith in love is fully assumed? I cannot bring myself, however, to perceive in the text a

admixture of mockery and earnest in the dilemma to which they might seem to fasten Him :—Now make preparation to take Thy kingdom, *or*—We will not permit Thee longer to speak and act as if Thou wert a king! It is altogether untrue, as our Lord's distinctive answer assures us, that their minds were in uncertainty and suspense. Their perfect understanding that He had said so already, is as obvious as their will not to believe it; consequently the hesitation, suspense, and uncertainty to which they complain that He subjects them, is a petulant and hypocritical taunt.

But the Lord gives a gracious and solemn reply, such as His truth and His love in their combined majesty alone could give. Let any one propose the question and receive the answer, and *feel* the contrast! He instantly repels the pertinacious unbelief which the specious question cannot conceal from Him; without any indignant rebuke (just because *they* spoke in bitterness) uttering the simple declaration of fact :—"Ye indeed believe not, either My words or My works, because ye are not My sheep! leave Me then alone, we have no sympathy with one another!" But then for the sake of others (those disposed to believe, ver. 21, some of whom were certainly present), He adds a most gracious and yet weightier *promise*, continuing the figure of the sheep—and carries this to an extent of open avowal even beyond that which they had sought, as to who and what He was—*One with the Father!* Thus their enmity does not cause Him to falter in His appealing invitation, or to discontinue His testimony and predictions, even to the end.

Vers. 25, 26. The εἶπον ὑμῖν standing first is itself a plain *Yes;* the καί with the Present πιστεύετε means—"*And* (or *but*) while I say it unto you again, ye nevertheless believe not." That is, Ye adhere to your unbelief, because I am the Christ in a different sense from yours—be it so! The mention of the

"Chiliast disposition to believe on the part of these Jews generally." As I understand the entire history of Jesus according to the four Evangelists, I am bound to conclude that *this Jesus*, just as He was, as He spoke, testified, and condemned, could never be to the Jews in Jerusalem a *persona grata* to *their* expectation of Messiah, although this might have been the case among the multitudes in Galilee. Lu. xix. 14 tells us—we will not have *this man* for a Messiah!

works in addition to the word refers manifestly to ver. 21. But we must not emphasize *My* sheep, as if a distinction from *other* sheep was intimated: for this would contradict the previous παροιμία, by the analogy of which we must emphasize. "Ye are not My *sheep*, ye are not souls which are disposed to hear and to follow. This fold (this temple) is of no avail to you!" Καθὼς εἶπον ὑμῖν we cannot regard (with Erasmus, Casaubon, and others) as a gloss, for the insertion of it would be unaccountable. But when did the Lord say what is here referred to? We need not at once go back to ch. viii. 45, 46, or anything similar; but there where He had been speaking *of His own sheep* it had been indirectly and per oppositum said to them that *they were not* of the number. Here is necessarily the point of *junction* between this word and the former. Expositors, and editors, and the Codd. themselves doubt whether the clause is to be construed with the former or the subsequent words: the question does not much affect the sense, since it forms a transition in either case; but we prefer the former—"*As I said lately*, My sheep *hear* My voice; this do not *ye*, therefore ye are not My sheep." This categorical declaration and rejection of our Lord opposes Lange's assumption that He designed to attract these interrogators by His promise.[1] No, in the contrast between the true sheep, by them vainly mocked and persecuted, whom He will protect, we discern the condemnation of *their* continuous and obstinate enmity against the Shepherd and the true little flock.

Vers. 27, 28. It is a good arrangement of these words, which makes ver. 27 the preliminary repetition of the description of the sheep, and ver. 28 the threefold promise which follows: yet since condition and promise are strictly intertwined, as well in Christ's word as in the reality itself, we may more properly regard "*I know them*" as already anticipating the promise. To hear and recognise the voice of the Lord as the voice of the Shepherd is the true *hearing*, by which the sheep are known and distinguished.[2] (Comp. Jno. xviii. 37, and Rev. iii. 20.) *To*

[1] He takes it in a political sense:—They would willingly trust themselves, in common with the people, into the hands of Jesus, as against the hands of the Romans! Such a false view of the question leads to an entire perversion of this so gracious, and so entirely spiritual, promise.

[2] "One may hear the *words* of the Lord, without submitting to His *voice*.

hear and *to follow*—these are the two great and all-important designations of the character of the sheep as such; but the transition from the former to the latter is effected by the gracious assurance of the Lord for the obedience of faith which comes between them; by this it is that strength is imparted for the obedience of the life. That assurance is—"I know thee, thou art Mine!" This word is given to them by the Lord for their consolation and defence against all the misconception and contempt of their enemies, just as the man born blind had found it; then follows with a repeated *and*, which simply confirms and corroborates it, the cumulative assurance. *I give unto them*—not indeed the temporal good of such an earthly Messiah-kingdom as ye have expected, but instead thereof what is infinitely better—*eternal life!* Mark, too, that it is the present tense δίδωμι, not the future δώσω. Because that is a life concealed in God, "the sheep in this world of goats may seem to be defenceless and wretched" (Berlenb. Bib.)—but they are blessed by the grace of their Shepherd with the assurance, notwithstanding, of eternal security. The perishing or being lost (Matt. xviii. 13, 14, comp. on Jno. vi. 39) is obviously parallel with the ἁρπάζεσθαι, for the δέδωκε here, as in chap. vi. 39, is set over against both; there is, however, a difference, for (as Bengel rightly observes) the former indicates rather the danger of erring from within and through their own fault, the latter the danger from external force. They perish not, because they have and retain the *life* which has been given to them; and because the Son *knoweth* them as His own, loveth and mightily defends them, *no man* can pluck them from Him. Least of all can ye evil shepherds do this, who cast them out of your synagogue, and by so doing only drive them to Me! This is the most direct meaning, but it goes further, and extends to the wolf, whose ἁρπάζειν had been already spoken of in ver. 12. Compare the prophecies of Isa. xl. 10, 11; Ezek. xxxiv. 22, 25, 28. *Out of Mine hand*, the power of the Strong One, anticipates the *ground* of this assurance, which the two following verses disclose.

Ver. 29. My Father hath *given* them to Me—see ch. vi. 37,

The voice of the Lord is the spiritually quickening influence of His words upon the heart of man." (Zeller im Monatsblatt.)

39. He is greater than *all*, for πάντων is evidently masculine, corresponding to τίς,—He is above, more mighty than all enemies, than all who have any power. If God is for them, who can be against them?[1] The truth that in *another* sense the Father is also greater than the Son (ch. xiv. 28) has no application to this passage; for here the unity of the Father and the Son is the truth which is to be plainly attested, and indeed it is attested by this very evidence, that those who are given into the hands of the Son remain yet in the hands of the Father. In this passage promise and assurance predominate, but it must be understood that they who are preserved by the power of God, are, however, only preserved through faith unto salvation (1 Pet. i. 5); and it would be a sheer perversion to give the Lord's words a predestinarian force as denying the possibility of falling away. They are secure if, and as long as, they remain *His sheep*, that is, follow Him, and depend upon Him according to His knowledge of them. If they cast off their dependence upon Him, then, indeed, they perish, but not as His sheep; no enemy, in that case, has plucked them away with mightier power, but they have destroyed themselves, and suffered themselves to be plucked away. "It is a protection of omnipotence working outwardly from within, which is here asserted; not a guarantee against our own selves. The possibility of backsliding proceeding from ourselves is not excluded by such passages as these; the freedom of man, who may anew engender sin in his own soul, is not taken away in the condition of regeneration." (Thiersch, Vorlesungen über Kathol. u. s. w. II. Aufl. II. 164.)

Ver. 30. This great saying supplements and explains the parallel words in ver. 16. We may thus supply the intermediate thoughts:—"No man shall pluck them out of My hand! Or does that seem too lofty a word? Should I rather say—out of My Father's hand? Then I say this also, and quite truly; but not as if My power were not enough. For know, in fine, what I now openly declare, and however little ye desired to hear it, that My hand, and the hand and power of God are the same—*I and My*

[1] The ancient reading ὃ and μεῖζον, which is in the Vulg., and followed by the Latin fathers, is entirely inapplicable.

Father are one!" Another inappropriate collocation with chap. xvii. 11, has induced many to speak of a unity of *will*, of disposition to love and protect the sheep, and then to argue from this "that true unity of will must necessarily imply unity of nature." But we can neither admit this last argument as incontestable,[1] nor the premise from which it is deduced, that unity of will is referred to.[2] Epiphanius against Noetus (hæres. 57, 10) has *διὰ τὸ εἶναι ἐν μιᾷ ἑνότητι θεότητος, καὶ ἐν μιᾷ γνώμῃ καὶ δυνάμει*, but we cannot see the propriety of this *γνώμη*, since it is the *hand* or *δύναμις*, which is obviously, distinctively, and indeed exclusively, spoken of, as the *οὐδεὶς δύναται* most abundantly shows. There is no question as to whether the Son and the Father might *will* to suffer one of the sheep to perish or be plucked away; this injurious thought does not enter the discourse, but *μείζων πάντων* simply means *mightier* than all the power of their enemies. That is a marvellous *μετάβασις* by which B.-Crusius resolves the meaning into:—"for what *I do* and what God *wills*, is one!" But that the unity of Divine *power*, that is, of omnipotence, can rest only upon unity of *nature*, is most evident and irrefragable; if Christ had not been God with the Father, but only man, it would have been most injurious to the honour of God, to declare His own and the Father's *hand* to be the same. It is to repel and silence this very objection, that He adds at the close the *personal* ἕν ἐσμεν. Fritzsche may decree, in his faithlessness to the plain words—ut *vero* unitatis nomen in hac disputatione nonnisi *similitudinem* indicare *potest!* Assuredly not so, for ἕν can signify by no possibility anything but ἕν. Compare, further, with this, the words of chap. xvi. 15—*All* that the Father hath is *Mine!* Here we have an incontrovertible dictum probans for the Trinitarian dogma, and Bengel's remark is as keen as it is lucid—per *sumus*

[1] For in chap. xvii. 11, 21, 22 there is a real difference between our union with the Son, and the unity of the Son with the Father,—see the last expression in ver. 26.

[2] The interpretation seizing only this idea, as Novatian introduced it and as adopted by the Socinians (which Teschendorff follows in his Nicodemus, p. 135, though whether in his own person, or in that of Nicodemus, is uncertain), is in fact not only one-sided, but essentially and utterly false and inharmonious.

refutatur Sabellius, per *unum* Arius. Although we can scarcely establish an original neuter in the language of the country which the Lord may have used, yet the Holy Spirit, through St John, has strictly defined the Greek ἕν, and not εἷς.[1] The Father and Son are, indeed, ἓν οὐσίᾳ, but not τῷ ὑποκειμένῳ or τῇ ὑποστάσει. (Orig. Selecta in Ps. cxxxv.) Not as Swedenborg teaches, one person Deus-homo, of which the Divine is termed the Father, the human the Son;—not the Sabellian υἱοπάτωρ;—not as if, according to Praxeas and Noetus, the Son might have said, "I am Myself the Father!" But the mystery of the personal distinction is as profoundly as clearly maintained—I and the Father; We—in the unity of nature, are *One*. Nothing more remains to be expounded here; let doctrine and speculation seek to penetrate this great mystery, but let it be in faith!

ASSERTION OF THIS LAST SAYING AGAINST CONTRADICTION. THE MANY GOOD WORKS. THE "GODS" AND THE SON OF GOD.

(Ch. x. 32–38.)

Stoning is *once more* the reply to the most piercing and luminous words of God, spoken as they had never before been spoken by man. That which is recorded concerning Moses the man of God, who bore the reproach of Christ not only before the Egyptians, but typically before Israel also (Ex. xvii. 4; Numb. xiv. 10), must have its fuller accomplishment, and unto greater glory, in the Lord. Then, "stoning" was merely spoken of once;—now they take up stones, and, indeed, the second time, bring stones with them. The repetition significantly rises in force. In ch. viii. 59 it was merely ἦραν,—they took up, in an impetuous paroxysm, the stones which lay in the way, rather, however, for symbolical demonstration than in actual earnest; and the Lord suddenly withdraws from them. But now ἐβάσ-

[1] As the Heb. New Test. found אֶחָד necessary. Nonnus serves himself by the paraphrase ἓν γένος—which, however, is inadequate, and might have been used concerning father and son among men.

τασαν, which indicates a more deliberate and earnestly significant rolling along of larger stones; and the Lord —? Peacefully waiting He stands still! As it was fit, His patient love also advances and keeps pace with their malice. "They seize the stones, He seizes their hearts." (Berlenb. B.) The Evangelist beautifully introduces His words with ἀπεκρίθη;—as if the interjection of the stones was but a continuation of the colloquy, and meets with this gentle response.

Ver. 32. His answer consists in a *question* which seeks to soften their stony hearts; and such is the sway which His words exert over their excited souls, that the stones at first remain unused in their hands, and are then laid down in order that they may answer *Him*. He imputes to them the full and fearful guilt of the act as if it had been accomplished; and does not qualify or abate the judgment pronounced upon it. This is not all which λιθάζετε involves; it further exhibits the voluntary submission to it on His part, provided He only knew *wherefore!* He speaks of the works of benevolence which He had showed them from the Father, but seems not to be capable of reflecting upon His own power to help Himself. I will lay down My life—this He had said before and now confirms it. But there is already indicated in this question the *evidence* of His claim to be one with the Father, the same proof from the *works* addressed to those who disbelieve the *words*, to which He refers again in ver. 38. And still we perceive majesty and humbleness blended;—that which He had exhibited to them, as the might of *His own* hand, is no other than ἐκ τοῦ πατρός μου, from the hand and power of the Father with whom He was one, in whom He lived, and from whom He received all things. For in ch. vii. 21 He had made mention of that one latest work only at which they had taken offence, although that involved a reference to multitudes of others; but now He expressly mentions His *many* works, and vindicates them as purely καλὰ ἔργα, deeds of benevolence, and proofs of love—comp. vers. 25 and 21. I have not merely given to your blind their sight, to your deaf their hearing, to your dumb their voices,—καλῶς πάντα πεποίηκα, Mar. vii. 37. Is it thus that ye thank your physician and benefactor, ye foolish and infatuated people? There is an undeniable tone of irony in this question, especially in the piercing διὰ ποῖον; that is, which

of My works has been so unhappily performed as to deserve the compensation of stoning? What has been the stamp and character of My acts that, aiming at benevolence, I should find this the result? Answer Me this! But what lamenting sorrow and entreating humility is at the same time in this irony!—Here finds its fulfilment what was foretold in Ps. cix. 5—And they have rewarded Me evil for good, and hatred for My love! As it is set forth afterwards in the apostolical preaching: Him who went about doing good, and healing all who were oppressed of the devil—they slew and hanged on a tree! (Acts x. 38, 39.)

There is sufficient good feeling left, however, in these Jews, to induce them to admit the series of good works which is thus pressed home upon their souls; they pause to contemplate them for a moment, but only that they may subvert the merit of these good works, and neutralise their own admission, by enforcing the guilt of blasphemy. The world is commonly content with the Divine works of the children of God, but their approbation is always qualified by the requirement—Say not that they are of God! Make them not a testimony of truth in thee in opposition to ourselves! They are ready enough here to concede the πολλά and πάντα καλὰ ἔργα, and do not contest the ποῖον αὐτῶν, though they use the somewhat derogating Singular; they do not even contradict the ἐκ τοῦ πατρός, nor do they cry out this time—All this Thou hast done through Beelzebub! *But* their obstinate unbelief can discern nothing in all this to abate the βλασφημία which attributes to man a *oneness* with God; and this is what they now design to say. We have already on ch. v. 18 exhibited their meaning in this; it is the final prelude of the condemnation before Caiaphas, and the accusation before Pilate.[1] This absolute abhorrence, however, of the union of the Divine and human natures, of an incarnation of the Divinity, of the human manifestation of the Angel of the Covenant who is the Lord Himself, must not by any means be explained as the true Old-Testament position. Our recent theology, returning to the true faith, has here one final ψεῦδος derived from Ration-

[1] It is also, as Olshausen observes, another proof that Χριστός ver. 24, and υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ now, did not signify one and the same thing *to them.*

alism to shake off, before it can in self-abnegation become perfectly one with the scriptural faith of their fathers, and with the Scripture itself. Dorner, after a process of investigation which contains much misapprehension of the Old Testament, comes to the conclusion that "according to the Old Testament position, it was an *impossible* assertion that *a man was God*, or the Son of God, in a sense not merely figurative, but actual and metaphysical." Alas, if this be so, then it follows from this impossibility that the outcry of βλασφημία, and the legal λιθάζειν as its punishment, were strictly justified! Then were the Jews, unprepared for this unheard-of θαῦμα of the manifestation of Jesus, which contradicted the whole Old Testament,—not simply exonerated, but justified, when they thwarted the wise counsel of God, and crucified the Lord of Glory. Then was *this* Christ, who declared Himself the *Son of God*, not properly He who was to come! And was this theology altogether unconscious of the consequences of such a view of the Old Testament? Dorner asserts still more plainly and boldly that "the word *Son of God* (already) in the Synoptics, cannot be referred back to the signification of this expression in the Old Testament." (p. 79.) But how then does the Lord Himself[1] refer it back to the *Scripture* which cannot be broken, to their *law?* How could He have done so, if the root and germ of this testimony to His own oneness, the oneness of a man, with God, was not to be found in that Scripture? Or did He this in an enfeebling accommodation, contrary to exegetical truth? He might have appealed to those fundamental passages, acknowledged by all ancient exposition, which in many ways indicated the Divine nature of the future Son of man, yea, literally asserted it; such as that in which He receives the all-holy, incommunicable name *Jehovah*, Jer. xxiii. 6, xxxiii. 16; comp. Isa. xlii. 8. But He penetrates deeper, as we shall see, and condescends to the level of the *Elohim-title* for sinful men, in order to show how by that title the rigid contrast between man and God, which *false* Judaism would urge against Him contrary to the true understanding of Scripture, is already broken and removed. Lange says much more to our satisfaction than

[1] As much stronger, Matt. xxii. 43–45. Is not David's Lord, also, in Ps. cx., at the same time—man and God?

Dorner with his well-meant but very dubious positions:—"The upholders of the *arrested*, retrogressive, and therefore *corrupted*, Judaism, were hindered thereby from discerning the spirit of the developed, glorified, perfected Judaism, in the (incarnate) *Personality of Christ.* They would allow only such spiritual *approximations* as those in which Jehovah, in strict *contradistinction* from man, comes near to His people through Moses and the Prophets—but never that God could become *one with* men." But the entire Old Testament, in fact, labours towards, and earnestly points to, this *becoming one* with man; and the approximations which we have mentioned are founded upon this great fact, and only through it are intelligible.[1]

Vers. 34–36. In regard to the *declaration concerning His Divinity*, which is thus enforced by stoning, He now asserts: —*first*, with that pacifying, yielding concealment of His full meaning which He so often adopted, that the form of speech which He used, externally considered, was not *blasphemous;*[2] and *then*, merging this accommodation in the great truth, in vers. 37, 38, He exhibits the deep foundation of His assertion concerning *Himself* in its very different meaning from the phraseology quoted. As to the former, He lays down before the Scribes, accustomed to disputation, a *word of Scripture* as the foundation of every phraseology which might be admitted in Israel; and after having in ver. 35 explained and confirmed it, He applies this Scripture, by the common conclusion *a minori ad majus*, to His own manner of expression, viewed also at first only externally. This last, nevertheless, spoken with the assumption of its deeper foundation—that He, sanctified of the

[1] So very beautifully Lange, in words with which, *rightly understood*, we heartily accord:—"Here we learn that a golden thread of doctrine, concerning God and man becoming one, runs through the entire Old Testament; the typical gods precede the true Son of God in the Son of man." Liebner, too, more fully:—"The *Old Testament* idea of God, in its full peculiar definiteness, is essentially the preparation for, the germ of, the expanded fulness of the Christian idea; and is clearly to be distinguished from the notion of God which *abstract Judaism* held." (Christol. I. 72.) Compare Martensen S. 275, and Nägelbach's last work—Der Gottmensch.

[2] "He cries peace into their stormy anger. Is it not written in your law? Now what will that mean? would be their thought." (Braune.)

Father, and sent into the world, was above all others that were called Elohim; and this leads to the exhibition of the works as its demonstration.

It must not be overlooked, at the very outset, that He does not repudiate for Himself, directly and absolutely, the name θεός—which, however, *must* have been His *first* word for their pacification, and His own vindication from the supposed βλασφημία, if that name were not justly assumed by Him;[1] but that He rather commences His maintenance and defence of this θεός εἰμι, by an only *analogous* θεοί ἐστε. But His words commence with a pacificatory tone through the striking apparent harmonising of their differences. Your general position—A man cannot be called God without blasphemy—is *false!*[2] This method of replying strikes, and at the same time disarms; it nullifies, while it holds fast the offensive truth. It attaches itself to an admitted point,—*almost* like the Apostle in Athens, who first allows the validity of the poet's saying—Τοῦ γὰρ καὶ γένος ἐσμέν; here, however, there is the difference that the Divine *Scripture* is quoted. And here we have once more that immoveable ἡ γραφή, in a phraseology which superficial exegesis misunderstands, attenuates, and would reduce to the level of heathenish forms of speech; but of which we shall be never weary of saying—"the true inspiration-theory must rest upon that centre from which this word sounds forth!" As we long ago said in another work[3]—"*The Scripture*—let many of our more recent orthodox theologians honestly test themselves whether they can simply repeat this little word after the Lord and His Apostles." That is, when taken in connection with the appended οὐ δύναται λυθῆναι. Its word down to every and each γεγραμμένον and γέγραπται remains a *law* for ever for the rule of all man's words concerning Divine truth; to explain as false, to abolish or remove one word in it, is a trespass, a punishable disobedience, just like the breaking of a commandment, ch. vii. 23 (or of the Sabbath, ch. v. 18). And no more than the law is abolished by breaking its precepts, can the Scripture in itself be *broken*, or proved to be false. It

[1] In this case before His enemies, as afterwards before Thomas, who worships Him by this name.

[2] Was not Moses also called a God to Aaron, Ex. iv. 16, vii. 1?

[3] Andeutungen für gläub. Schriftverst. ii. S. 481.

is the discipline of faith to submit to this fact; to expound Scripture with this absolute conviction, is the task of exegesis; to understand and to embrace this presupposition in faith, without seeking a foundation elsewhere, is the fundamental object of all systematic theology.[1]

"In *your* law"—this expression is in part to be received as we expounded it on ch. viii. 17, but here more definitely,—"That law which is spoken to *you* sinners, which obliges and binds *you*, and in which ye make your boast in opposing Me, but which, as I will show, is *not* opposed to Me, and the testimony to Myself which ye have deemed blasphemous!" Νόμος for a passage in the Psalms, is not to be explained by the wider use of that name for Scripture generally, but it is used with a special twofold reference:—first, because (as we have just said) all Scripture must be taken as the *norm* of all permissible and right language; and then, secondly, because the cited passage of the Psalm itself rests upon *Mosaic sentences*, which are therefore themselves actually at the same time quoted.

Who, then, are the *θεοί* or אֱלֹהִים of the eighty-second Psalm?[2] Most assuredly not heathen tyrants, as a recent perverted opinion imagines; for God never spake to them, and to them He never assigned the title and dignity of His own majesty. Nor are they Israelitish *kings* preeminently or exclusively. For, as we have elsewhere said, it is altogether a "new discovery, that kings are in the Old Testament sons of God; we seek in vain for a single passage, in which a heathen king, or even an Israelitish king, excepting David and Solomon as types of the Messiah, received the honour of that name." Those who are declared to be Elohim, or representatives and images of God, are in this Psalm, as in the law of Moses, the *Judges* in Israel, which would then include the kings, of course, in as far as they might be said to judge supremely. For see it plainly stated in vers. 2–5 of the Psalm! De Wette and Gesenius (in the Thesaurus) groundlessly deny the *personal* reference of אֱלֹהִים to the Judges

[1] Which would not, like Rothe recently, speculate as if there were no Scripture. And not merely arrange the Scriptural views in prosegomena by themselves.

[2] Comp. here generally my Ausgewählten Psalmen ii. 174.

in Ex. xxi. 6, xxii. 8, 9, 28;[1] for the parallelism in ver. 28, and the אֵתֶּם of the Psalm (here ἐκείνους), prove clearly the attribution of a title of honour to these official persons. *I have said*, Ye are gods; that is, should be so termed—this is manifestly in the Psalm a reference back to the Mosaic passages, or to the installation into office with which this title was associated. In the strong words wherewith the Lord closes, the λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ which came to them, can similarly mean no other than that same εἶπα. The words cannot refer to the whole people of Israel (as Ebrard says), for the ἐκεῖνοι are already singled out as special persons from the עֲדַת אֵל of ver. 1. And as little are prophets and pious men meant,[2] as having received a *revelation* from God (וַיְהִי דְבַר יְהוָה אֲלֵיהֶם);—but they are no more and no less than the judging, ruling officers among the people, to whom this name might come and did come from above—"Ye shall be called gods!" and de Wette rightly maintains against Olshausen that here, in the domain of the Old Testament types and shadows, there is not necessarily involved a real union of the personality with God, corresponding with the name. For God, who has reserved to Himself the prerogative of judging even these "gods," here first reproves them for their unrighteousness, and then goes on to announce and predict to them:—I have *truly* named you gods, *but* not the less on that account shall ye die (in your sins) like men! We should not, however, go too far on the other side, and regard the conclusion to which the Lord leads their minds, as only meaning:—"If the mere *semblance* of the name is not to be treated with disrespect, should the thing itself, the nature and the Word of God be so?"[3] For it is most certain that wherever the name of an office had sunk into a mere lying semblance, the abolition or resumption of that title is foretold—and sooner or later most surely fulfilled. It is just *this* which gives so much significance to the Lord's words—though overlooked by most expositors—that He quotes a passage of Scrip-

[1] According to them its meaning is just equivalent to לִפְנֵי יְהוָה, Deut. xix. 17!

[2] Bahrdt:—Such men as had become like God in their beneficence to man!

[3] Thus speaks Rudelsbach in the Predigtsammlung—Der Herr Kommt i 455.

ture which refers to these very Pharisees and Rulers of the people to whom He Himself was so obnoxious; at once conceding *to them* the theocratical dignity, and predicting its loss as the judicial infliction of God. He does not expressly quote in detail *this* wider subject of the Psalm, but these students of Scripture would understand His allusion. We very often find in our Lord's citations such a warning, threatening undertone in the connection to which they silently refer.

Is it not written in *your* law, that God called *you* yourselves gods—ye should well know what is recorded there, and what follows from it. Thus the ὑμῶν derives a new meaning, which makes the ἐστέ of the quotation an immediate address to those who then heard Himself: for though not all those who took up stones were leaders of the people, the speakers of ver. 33 were such. Very far from true is it "that the Lord applied this declaration to Himself *in His need* against His embittered enemies, who would on the spot stone Him to death."[1] Oh no, there is no question here of need, or of any refuge in a quotation which itself would break the Scripture by vaguely or incorrectly applying it;[2] His peaceful word, ver. 32, had already quelled the violence which would stone Him, and reopened the controversy. But Meyer (Lichtbote ii. 181) has given us a correct view:—"Is it too high an assumption, He said with *that lofty irony* which He often used in dealing with their folly—Is it too much that I term Myself God; what if I show you out of Scripture that *ye yourselves* (sinners and false judges!), that *your forefathers* (in office) are called gods? May it not be allowed Me, to regard Myself as equally great with *them?*"

The allusion to these present אֱלֹהִים in the congregation of God, to whom He was then speaking, He does indeed wisely leave in the background; and turns His application and deduces His conclusion, with reference to ἐκείνοις, those whom the Psalm then addressed. There is now a twofold distinction and progression:—*His* person is incomparably higher than they, and yet He has

[1] The excellent Kleuker thus speaks in a manner unworthy of himself! Johannes, Petrus, und Paulus als Christologen, p. 49.

[2] As Sepp:—According to these words of Scripture ye could not fasten any blame upon me, if I should sophistically explain them!!

not plainly called Himself θεός, only υἱὸς θεοῦ. As the conclusion from this—How can ye designate *blasphemy* the appropriation of the more humble *name* by the supremely higher *person?* Even in the Psalm בְּנֵי עֶלְיוֹן stands parallel with אֱלֹהִים as its explanation—this our Lord mentions not, any more than that conversely *His* υἱὸς θεοῦ is indeed equivalent to θεός. But now what a difference of persons—this He makes on that account all the more prominent. Those—men, sinful men, mortals, upbraided with the denunciation of death, who only bore for a while in common with many the name of God because a word of communion had come πρὸς αὐτούς, unto them. He, on the other hand, is the One, *through whom* the Father speaketh to the world, Himself the *word* of God! Those only temporary, transitional, typically clothed with their dignity, which did not so cleave to their persons as that it could not be revoked and taken from them—He, on the contrary, one in whom "Being and office are one!" (As von Gerlach excellently says.) They shamefully desecrated their office—He as the true Son of God is *sanctified* of the Father: that is, sanctified from His birth, rather *before* His birth sealed with the impress of pure holiness of the Father (see on ch. vi. 27), and, thus sealed, sent as the Holy One of God into an unholy world![1] And yet He had not once said—I am God! though with infinitely truer right, and in a very different sense, it belonged to Him to say so.

This progressive and cumulative contrast of His person with the ἐκείνοις, should have saved every intelligent and conscientious interpreter from so impairing His words as to make them signify—that He merely arrogated to Himself Divine dignity in the sense of a title, not aiming to be *Deus vel filius Dei dictitius!* No truly, the λεγόμενοι θεοί in heaven and on earth (1 Cor. viii. 5, rulers, gods, angels, in the widest sense, as the first verse of Ps. lxxxii. touches the limits of them all) are only types and shadows which point to the one God, as to the Father, so also to His true Representative, essentially invested

[1] With Augustine and Beza to refer this ἡγίασε to the eternal generation, is inappropriate: Yet is it not a mere separation, as Jer. i. 5, and Gal. i. 15, but appears to precede the ἀπέστειλεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον.

with all His greatness and supremacy, our Lord Jesus Christ! The אֱלֹהִים אַתֶּם וּבְנֵי עֶלְיוֹן כֻּלְּכֶם of the Psalm, yea even the בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים, and the אֵלִים of the angels, is much less than the singular בְּנִי אַתָּה of the *second* Psalm spoken of the King of kings, the בַּר simply and preeminently, whose wrath hurls into swift destruction. But *this* is assuredly the undertone of our Lord's argument, that any arrogation of the *name of God* was permitted to *men* at all; consequently that the phraseology of Holy Scripture itself must be termed blasphemous, *if* all such *typical* designation and dignity did not maintain its right and truth as prophetic of, and an aspiration of Scripture towards, a real communication of the Divine Majesty to human nature, and oneness with it. Neander says quite correctly: "Christ sought to prove it to their apprehension, that the idea of a communication of the Divine Majesty to human nature was by no means foreign to the revelations of the Old Testament. *If* the gulf between God and all things finite was infinite and impassable, it must have been blasphemy *in any sense* to attribute the name Elohim to mortal men." *So far* the Lord here gives to Israel, to whom the *οὐ δύναται λυθῆναι ἡ γραφή* still held good as an irrefragable axiom, a profound proof *for the existence of a God-man*, out of the *inmost heart* of the Old Testament. Every fellowship of God with men, which went so far as to attribute the Divine attributes and prerogatives to such men, presupposes as a truth which should find its realisation, a real union of God and man in the Person of Him who filled in Himself all offices, who was to come and make all names into essential realities. The Lord, consequently, here asserts the direct opposite of the position of Dorner before quoted; and expressly contradicts all who are constantly talking about the "rigid, absolute antithesis of God to all creature" in the Old Testament. As the despised Berlenb. Bible so well expresses it:—"He shows them that if they knew the Scriptures rightly, they would not oppose God and man to each other. Where is the foundation of offices upon earth? With respect to the office of the Messiah they are but shadowy offices, and yet the men who hold them are termed gods: *God thereby from the beginning would accustom your people to think beforehand of more than that.*"

Vers. 37, 38. This whole argument from Scripture against the

βλασφημια of ver. 33, and the contradiction of their assertion σὺ ἄνθρωπος ὢν from which the ποιεῖς σεαυτόν follows of course, —was, however, only *hypothetical*, for He only asked them :— "*Supposed*, that I am the Holy One, sanctified of the Father and sent into the world, He who is actually so delineated, promised, and typified throughout your Old Testament—where is then the blasphemy in My testimony concerning My oneness with the Father?" Therefore the Lord spoke first of Himself in the third person, and then afterwards passed over to the first in His εἶπον. Hence it follows as a necessary conclusion—*And am I not He?* But in asserting this He still graciously condescends to them; not demanding of them that higher and better "belief *in Him* or His entire Personality, and especially His *word* as its most spiritual expression and utterance," which was found in those who were of God, and heard His voice. With the utmost moderation, as it were, He admits it as an unreproved supposition that they do *not* believe in Him: nay more, He declares in the imperative—If I do not the works of My Father, *believe Me not?* But by this He seizes them, and holds them fast, leaving them no way of escape; He simply repeats His frequent appeal to the testimony of His works, referring now in εἰ δὲ ποιῶ to their own tacit admission in ver. 33, in order that He may subvert and bring to nought their falsely asserted independence of His good works, and His blasphemous words. The last saying which is given them for their *perception* and faith—ὅτι ἐν ἐμοὶ ὁ πατὴρ, κἀγὼ ἐν αὐτῷ (or, after Lach. and Tischend. ἐν τῷ πατρί)—is the *descending*, and yet true, explanation of the rejected ἕν ἐσμεν.[1] I have not said—I and God: but merely—I and the *Father;* have called Myself the Son of God, in the sense, assuredly, of the oneness of Divine nature. Chrysostom :—"I am no other than the Father, only that I remain the Son, and the Father remaineth the Father."

---

[1] Therefore not, however, merely distinguished in the expression; so that the Jews here, ver. 33, and in ch. v. 18, might have *incorrectly* regarded the Son of God, and equality with God or being God, as one and the the same. (Hofmann Schriftb. i. 116.) I confess that I do not understand what kind of exaggeration of Christ's Divinity is here meant to be protested against.

The result even of this utterance, received by that unbelief which was rigidly set against all His true words, and all His good works, was the same as it had hitherto been: demonstrating the truth of our Saviour's words (ver. 26). Once more does St John record a πάλιν (ver. 39), even as ver 19, and ver. 31. They have given up their design to stone Him; but they will lay hands on Him to bring Him to judgment and condemnation, and He—withdraws once more from their power, escapes their hands! Nothing more was to be done for them. Thus the stern conclusion of His public life and testimony, ch. xii. 37–40, is already here foreshadowed and prepared for.

Then does the Lord retire to the scene of His first public appearance, where the Baptist had prepared for Him, testified of Him, and pointed the multitudes to Him. There He *abode;* as if to bring that early time back to the people's minds, and, as it were, ready to begin anew with them the great work of His life. The Evangelist records that with accuracy, inasmuch as it serves his purpose as bringing back this preparatory conclusion of our Lord's ministry to its starting-point in his prologue, ch. i. 6, 7.[1]

Those who were in a sense believers, or inclined to believe; and who have been often mentioned as all together πολλοί in number, gather together around the Lord, having sought Him after His withdrawal. The expression which they use, as uttered before the approaching end, and therefore more significant, may be regarded as prophetic, or as testifying in the name of the whole people—John spake the truth, *This is He!* As Jews they cannot indeed forget the *miracles*, yet are they half unconsciously constrained to utter a great and remarkable truth to us: —the last and greatest Prophet before Christ, who compelled the whole people to an avowal of repentance, enforced from them also the acknowledgment that the *evidence of miracles for the acceptance of Himself was not absolutely* indispensable. (See our observations on ch. v. 33.) The fulfilment of his—He will

[1] Or was it withal (after Luthardt)—in order to place at the close the unbelief in the ample testimony of Jesus to Himself, in contrast with the faith of those who had received the Baptist's direction to Jesus? But we have nothing here said distinctively of a faith which had been from the beginning produced by the Baptist.

come after me! by His actual coming after was his one great miracle or sign. (Deut. xviii. 21, 22.) All things that John spake of *this man*—ἀληθῆ ἦν, that is, have approved themselves true; and faith now retrospectively sees the truth, with shame for its unbelief:—veritas est vera, etiam antequam agnoscatur (as Bengel most pertinently explains this ἦν).

May this be the result in the case of every one for whom this prayer is applicable; that He may be gathered into the little company found in the midst of the mass of unbelieving people, of whom the Gospel can say for their encouragement and joy—*and many believed on Him!*

POSTSCRIPT.

During the publication of the first edition of this work on the Words of Jesus, Lange's Leben Jesu was making its simultaneous appearance; and consequently we had only the opportunity of an alternate transitory glance at each other's pages. During the issue of the second edition, the same unfortunate coincidence has occurred in the case of Luthardt's work on the Gospel of St John. Reference has been made to this book no further than to the end of the fourth chapter, for the press could not wait for the issue of the second volume. Had it been otherwise, Luthardt's name would have often been quoted among other representatives of exegetical views; and many an observation commented on which cannot now be referred to in detail. Such views of his as seem most pressingly to demand mention may be alluded to in the way of postscript. Luthardt has copiously referred to my Reden Jesu, and has thereby laid me under obligation; but there are many instances in which I cannot yield to his authority, or admit his corrections. It is needless to inflict upon the reader the whole collective points of difference between us in the section from ch. v. to ch. x.; nor shall I enter into the discussion of such points as his different arrangement of a whole theme (as p. 25, 33), or his modification of details (such as p. 19, *οἱ ἀκούσαντες*—p. 75, mockingly—p. 82 *διὰ τοῦτο*—p. 85, Irony or question—p. 107 *τὰ κάτω*—p. 158, 159, those who see).—But the following points I must be permitted to dilate upon, on account of the intrinsic importance of his work itself, as well as for the sake of the completeness of my own.

That the prosecution of my contemplation, upon ch. v. 19, 20, into the *mysterium Trinitatis* should be condemned (p. 12), as passing beyond the immediate meaning of the text and its exegetical design, results from the fundamental difference between my relation to the Word and that of Luthardt as representing systematic

university theology. Whatever the sacred Word speaks to our thoughtful meditation abidingly exercised upon it, and to our "systematic theological thinking" quickened by its influence—I include within the range of pure exposition, as developing the principles and exhibiting the kernel of the word of God, or in scriptural language as opening the Scripture. Nor can I submit to sacrifice the backgrounds of deeper meaning which unfold speculative truth, to the system of *historical* hermeneutics, in any such manner as that which Hofmann has brought into vogue. As to this question, we cannot admit that in St John's Gospel the doctrine concerning the Father and the Son is to be confined within the rigorous bounds of the mere historical relation and significance of these terms in the scheme of salvation, and that no legitimate exposition can go beyond. If it is said that *the Son* is "the man who came forth from God, and is come into the world"—we maintain, on the other hand, that He is God also proceeding, and who hath proceeded forth from God, who hath become man, and is come into the world;—as is most expressly declared in ch. xvi. 28, xvii. 5. Luthardt's refusal to admit "an eternal going forth within the Being of God," springs from the arbitrariness of a restricted and prejudiced devotion to a system. Just as certainly as the economical Trinity must be developed in theology, all that is spoken concerning it must rest upon the deeper foundation of the immanent Trinity; we are therefore necessarily referred to this innermost application of the term, and required to make it prominent.

Elsewhere, as at p. 15 (touching the κρίσις, ch. v. 22), the question of the maintenance of a full and deep meaning beyond the limits of the immediate and obvious meaning, is again discussed. For myself, I am firmly convinced that an "arbitrary limitation" may be alleged against the narrow school-exegesis with at least as much propriety as an "arbitrary extension" may be alleged against me. And I am further persuaded that, as time rolls on, and the injurious influence of our past and present merely human school-commentators declines, as decline it does and will, very many of the new race of school-theologians, rejoicing in a living faith, will come to take a supreme delight in exploring the depth and fulness of the Words of God.

Before deciding that the θαυμάζειν, ch. v. 28 (p. 23), be-

tokened a merely unbelieving wonder, and not a state of mind suddenly affected for good, I would suggest that in ver. 28 our Lord continues His words with a somewhat more trusting and elevated apprehension on the part of His hearers. Stiff-necked unbelief is not represented throughout this Gospel as always and everywhere confronting our Saviour and His discourses, as Luthardt says. He is perfectly right in this general view, but too strenuous in carrying it into the detail: for we perceive occasionally the beginnings of faith, and fitful tendencies to listen attentively, which our Lord's words excite; and these must be carefully observed and estimated if we would understand this Gospel aright.

At p. 27 there is a misunderstanding, as if Bengel and myself referred the article in ὁ λύχνος (ch. v. 35), immediately to Ecclus. xlviii. 1. Bengel says merely—innuit prædicta in V. T. de Johanne—and that is my meaning, with which Luthardt also agrees, "*the* light which should go before me." The reference to the passage as showing the fixed proverbial representation of the character of Elias is another point; but that we have λαμπάς and not λύχνος results from the Holy Spirit's principle of not carefully giving apocryphal quotations in their literality.[1]

In referring ch. v. 37 still to the testimony of the *works*, and thereby introducing that of *the word* first in ver. 38, I am regarded (p. 30) as only making the matter more obscure. But I confidently point to the parallelism between the μεμαρτύρηκε and the previous ἔδωκε of ver. 36. The Lord does not place the witness of the works as "mediate" over against that of the Scripture as immediate, but rather as the "most immediate" testimony itself of the Father (long present since the manifestation of the Son); and to this statement I must adhere. Then follows in the *second* clause of ver. 37 the *transition*, giving the grounds of the unbelief in the works, to the testimony of the *word;* as it comes forward first, ver. 38, in τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ.

There is a misunderstanding also in p. 32, upon ch. v. 39, inasmuch as I concur with Luthardt in saying that the Lord

[1] My defence of the Apocrypha enters more fully upon this.

educes the truth which still clung to the proud delusion of the Jews in their bind and formal dependence on Holy Scripture. If my entire remarks had been carefully noted, I should not have been classed with Hilgenfeld against Hofmann, with whom in the second edition I have stated my perfect concurrence.

In ch. v. 42, I must insist (against p. 34) that the *love* of God in them, as the life, ver. 40, is primarily the love which God sheds in us. This seems to me alone appropriate, much more so certainly than "the due love to the God of Israel," which was wanting to them as "not Israelites indeed." The Lord's words penetrate everywhere in this connection into the inmost, most mystical principles; and love to God is only found wanting as the influence and result of *God's own love.*

The deep-thinking reader must decide whether (according to p. 38) the definition "writings" in ch. v. 47 for the word and testimony of Moses as opposed to the *words* of Jesus, is a matter of perfect indifference.

I cannot concede that in ch. vi. 51 (p. 59) the weight of manuscripts preponderates for the omission of ἣν ἐγὼ δώσω, against internal criticism. The declaration that this future *giving* has no reference whatever to the *death* of Christ, arbitrarily contradicts the fundamental spirit and principle of the whole discourse (which already in ver. 27 points to no other than that in the δώσει).

The plain testimony of the text, ch. vi. 64, against the "partaking of unbelievers," is weakened (p. 61), in a manner as subtle as that of Kahnis; an "*apparent*, unconditional, and ineffectual influence of the eating and drinking" is spoken of: but I must lament over this Lutheran prejudice, which hinders so many excellent men from reading the words in their simplicity. It is a strange refuge to fly to, that "the possible cases of exception are not to be taken account of;" this will not cause us to "lay down the weapons of our war against the Lutheran doctrine"—that is, will not constrain us to give up the plain words of Scripture for ecclesiastical dogmatics.

I never asserted that the seeking of the Jews, ch. vii. 11, was *only* hostile (p. 78), but connecting it with ver. 1, remarked upon it as *primarily* hostile, and discerned in it the transition to a general inquiry after the usual guest at the feast.

In ch. vii. 23 (p. 84) I am not contented with the contrast to the *whole man* which is found in "the specific aspect of the body as the agent of propagation;" and I must hold, with Bengel and Olshausen, that not only must ὅλον ἄνθρωπον refer to body and *soul*, but that in circumcision there was a promising sign and seal of spiritual soundness.

I cannot understand why Luthardt, p. 89, takes no notice of my many reasons against the common exposition of chap. vii. 37, 38; but must all the more urgently bespeak attention to them again.

The view of chap. viii. 25, given in p. 110, 111, which reads ὅτι and translates *that*, does not satisfy me, and indeed is almost incomprehensible.

On p. 114, 115, I must observe, that those who reply in chap. viii. 33 must be the πολλοί addressed before with ὑμεῖς; and that I cannot by any means think the continuation in ver. 37 "impossible," since those who fall back from the beginning of faith might again be included in the *turba promiscua*.

Similarly, the remark upon ch. viii. 33 (p. 117), that the Jews had interpreted the word *truth* (which they did *not* overlook) as the "true relation to God," is harsh and constrained. How would this accord with the *knowing* of the truth?

The protest against my exposition of chap. viii. 44 (p. 124) springs from a misunderstanding; since the *truth* must in both cases be "the objective truth of God," when it is said that the devil was not in it, or *it was not in him*. How the latter is only the "*ethical* being," I cannot understand. It is with this as with the "love of God" previously; but here Satan's not abiding in the truth of God is rather the reason wherefore it did not abide in him.

We must still maintain (against p. 142–144) that in chap. ix. 4 Jesus speaks of a night *for Himself*, in which He can no longer work as before; this is plainly expressed in the words, and not an addition of ours, for the "I must work" and "no man can work" plainly correspond. Thus the mere limitation to day or night "for the world" has the plain text opposed to it; and would not satisfy the "*for*," which, although not spoken, is plainly to be understood.

We will not contend about the more direct meaning of the

Porter, ch. x. 3, as referred to p. 163. It is a matter of personal feeling whether we will adhere strictly to the abstract idea in these similitudes (here the opening), or strive to find a deeper allusion; but I must protest against the assertion that no man *has a right* to the latter course.

As to the πρὸ ἐμοῦ, ch. x. 8, Besser has assented to my ex position; it must therefore be "conceivable." And what is there inconceivable in the premature rushing in before the right door is sought and found? That Christ speaks, between the door of ver. 7 and the door of ver. 9, of His own Person as the door, appears obvious; for, we cannot suppose Him to have intermediately dropped the figure. The view taken by Luthardt, p. 167, 168,—placing Christ after themselves, preferring their own persons to Him,—appears to us to depart from the whole simile. And on account of this alone, not to mention other reasons, it cannot be received.

We must leave it to every accurate reader to determine, whether the ἁρπάζειν of ch. x. 28 (p. 186) can refer only to spiritual powers which imperil the inner life, and not rather to force from without, as here exhibited *in specie* of the wicked shepherds, and with allusion to ch. ix. 34, 35.

As to the rejection, p. 187, of my trinitarian dogmatics in the interpretation of ch. x. 30, I must refer to what has been already said. I have asserted, and still assert, against Hofmann, that the qualified and lower formula of ver. 38 is not strictly one with that ἕν ἐσμεν.

That, finally, in ver. 35, the λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ must primarily mean the εἶπα of the Psalm (resting again upon earlier utterances), I did certainly assert; not, however, as intending it to refer to the address contained in the Psalm (p. 192), but to that which was *quoted* in this εἶπα, and exhibited in it as an earlier λόγος—Ye are gods.

END OF VOLUME FIFTH.

THE

WORDS OF THE LORD JESUS.

BY

RUDOLF STIER,

DOCTOR OF THEOLOGY, CHIEF PASTOR AND SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHKEUDITZ.

VOLUME SIXTH.

TRANSLATED FROM THE SECOND REVISED AND ENLARGED GERMAN EDITION.

BY THE

REV. WILLIAM B. POPE,

NEW EDITION.

PHILADELPHIA:
SMITH, ENGLISH, AND CO.
NEW YORK: SHELDON & CO. BOSTON: GOULD & LINCOLN.

MDCCCLX.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME SIXTH.

THE GOSPEL OF ST JOHN.

Page

First Fore-announcement of the Raising of Lazarus. The Honour of the Son of God. Walking in the Day. The Setting forth, ch. xi. 4, 7, 9–11, 14, 15, ... 1

Jesus and Martha. Second Fore-announcement: the Resurrection and the Life, ch. xi. 23, 25, 26, ... 20

The Sepulchre, the Stone, Faith, the Thanksgiving to the Father, the Raising, ch. xi. 34, 39–44, ... 33

The Anointing at Bethany, ch. xii. 7, 8; Matt. xxvi. 10–13; Mark xiv. 6–9, ... 58

Last public Declaration concerning his coming Death. The Corn of Wheat, and his Discipleship; the Prayer of Anguish; the Glorification; the brief Continuance of the Light, ch. xii. 23–36, . 75

The Evangelist's Summary of the Public Testimony of Jesus, ch. xii. 44–50, ... 101

The Washing of the Feet, and its Signification, ch. xiii. 7–20, . 109

The Second and more direct Indication of the Traitor, after the Supper, ch. xiii. 26, 27, ... 141

The Glorification of the Son of Man; the Entrance into the Inaccessible; the New Commandment, ch. xiii. 31–35, . . 149

The First Intimation of Peter's Denial, ch. xiii. 36–38; Luke xxii. 34, ... 172

Farewell Discourses of Jesus to His Disciples until His Setting out, ch. xiv. 1–31, ... 175

Faith in God and in Jesus. His Going before into the Father's House: Himself the way: the Father in Him as He in the Father, ch. xiv. 1–10, ... 181

Page

The Greater Works; the Praying and Loving; Fellowship with the departed Lord through the Comforter, in whom He and the Father Himself come; Separation in this from the World, ch. xiv. 11–24, ... 207

The Holy Ghost, once more, as Teacher and Remembrancer; the Peace left behind, and Given anew through His Departure to the Greater Father; the Powerlessness of the Prince of the World in his Aggression upon Him, ch. xiv. 25–31, . . 242

Renewed Farewell Discourses during the delay of the setting forth, chs. xv. xvi. Similitude of the Vine and the Branches, ch. xv. 1–6, ... 262

The Interpretation of the Similitude: the Love of the Lord in His Disciples bringing forth its Fruit, ch. xv. 7–17, . . 282

The Hatred of the World to the Disciples of their Lord: the Inexcusable Sin of Unbelief, ch. xv. 18–25, ... 298

The Testimony of the Spirit of Truth against the World: Prediction to obviate Offence, ch. xv. 26–xvi. 4, ... 315

The Comforter obtained by His departure will Convince the World, and glorify Jesus to His Disciples, ch. xvi. 5–15, . . 331

The way of the First Disciples, as typical for all Futurity, through Sorrow to Joy; the Joy of Birth; the perfect Joy of seeing Him again in that Day, ch. xvi. 16–24, ... 369

Final Reference to the Great Future: now in Parable, then Openly: the Love and Faith of the Disciples in much Weakness: last Consolation derived from His overcoming the World, ch. xvi. 25–33, ... 393

The High-priestly Prayer, ch. xvii. 418

HARMONY.

	Page		Page
Matt. xxvi. 10–13, . .	58	John xii. 7, 8, . .	58
Mark xiv. 6–9, . .	58	,, xiii. 36–38, . .	172
Luke xxii. 34, . .	172		

THE GOSPEL OF ST JOHN.

FIRST FORE-ANNOUNCEMENT OF THE RAISING OF LAZARUS. THE HONOUR OF THE SON OF GOD. WALKING IN THE DAY. THE SETTING FORTH.

(John xi. 4, 7, 9–11, 14, 15.)

We already know the little household of Bethany, united in the happy bonds of Ps. cxxxiii.: blessed before of the God of Israel because of their religious mutual love; but now still more blessed, because *loved* with a special love by the Son of God manifest in the flesh. Diverse in their temperament and disposition—as in Mary and Martha we see the one with more facility pressing on to the choice of the one thing needful, and the other struggling with the needless unrest of her well-meaning mind—they were yet one in God, and in sincere faith towards Jesus, who therefore loved them all. This family of Bethany was selected, that in it, and for it, should take place the final, greatest, and most public miraculous attestation of the honour of the Son of God; the witness, that is, that He who was about to surrender Himself to death and the grave, was Himself the Resurrection and the Life. The sacred love of their Divine Friend designs, by leading their weak faith through the bitterness of death, to heighten its subsequent joy. We may well suppose that the enmity of the Jews would hereafter the more virulently burn against them in consequence; and to our minds the old opinion is not altogether so "untenable" as some now think, that the reason is to be sought in this for the remarkable silence of the Synoptics concerning the resurrection of Lazarus.[1]

[1] Lange enters very cautiously and discriminatingly into the merits of

This, however, is but one hypothesis, and much more might be added in explanation; so much, indeed, as effectually to shield them from Baur's insinuation against their historical credit in relation to this matter.

Suffice it, that St John's narrative in the eleventh chapter is so transparently true, and so entirely stamped with those attributes of historical simplicity and confidence which are impressed upon all the narratives of his Gospel, that only the blind can fail to discern the glory of God in it; and they to whom it is obscure darken their own apprehension by their own critical counsel. He presupposes an acquaintance with the whole substance of the so-called Synoptical tradition, and with the memorable sisters; for he indicates the *τὶς ἀσθενῶν Λάζαρος* first generally as *ἐκ τῆς κώμης αὐτῶν*, and immediately afterwards as their *brother*. Although he himself afterwards (ver. 5) arranges the three persons probably according to their ages and external position,[1] yet it is significant that in ver. 1 he mentions *Mary* first, who as a disciple was better known, and inwardly nearer to the heart of the Lord, and whose *anointing* was to be spoken of wherever the Gospel was preached. It is on this account that he presupposes in his readers a special acquaintance with *this* circumstance, down to the wiping of the feet with her hair—although himself afterwards commissioned to record it.

These sisters communicate to the Lord a very delicately worded, but urgent *request for help*, for their beloved brother lies dangerously sick. There needs no proof that *ἀσθενεῖν* is used of one in extreme peril of sickness (as Grot. remarks): comp. Acts ix. 37; Phil. ii. 26, 27. They would hardly have sent to Jesus so far, if there had not been danger of life; and the Lord's reply responds to the *feared πρὸς θάνατον*. Vers. 21

the question, ascribing this considerate silence to their original traditional formation, before the actual composition of the Gospels. On the other hand, Luthardt summarily dismisses all such consideration as superfluous and gratuitous.

[1] According to Lu. x. 38, Martha was the mistress of the house. Lazarus, the youngest, who now sank into early death for a brief space, might have dwelt with them, though neither ch. xi. nor ch. xii. 2 decides anything on this point. Dräseke suggests that Martha might be here mentioned first, to show that she was equally dear to Jesus with Mary.

and 32 afterwards show what they desired and hoped for. But what refined humility and confident urgency are blended in the message, as St John gives it to us in its most concise and simple truth! There is no trace of any lamentation or protest that one dear to the Son of God should be sick, as if that were a thing unseemly; it is only tasteless perversion of interpretation to put such a meaning into their words: a thoughtful application would learn from them, and teach, the truth that one whom the Lord loveth may quite consistently with that high privilege be sick. They may, indeed, presume that they have a claim to His help for cure or rescue from death:—yet only the right of grace on account of *His* love. They say not—He who loveth Thee so well, but—He *whom Thou lovest* in Thy free and great benevolence, whom Thou "honourest with Thy regard." Yet it seems to them too much to say at once (as Nonnus inserts) *ὃν φιλέεις σκοπίαζε.* The simple "*behold!*" connected with the "Lord!" which brings to mind His power, is enough for them: no further *expression* of request or reliance was needed. That He loves them too, his sisters, and for their sake will restore their brother, is reserved in humble silence.

Ver. 4. "The Lord" (vers. 2 and 3) responds to *such* a summons in a very marvellous manner, and not now as elsewhere to the urgent and unseasonable supplication of one altogether unknown. That He does give a reply, admits of no doubt. Schleiermacher, indeed, seems not to know "from this brief account" whether this was His reply, or a notice which He gave to His disciples concerning the character of the sickness(!)—but we cannot suppose the Evangelist's narrative to be so brief as to have excluded the Lord's response to the message. The Lord assuredly gives a reply in ver. 4, although in strikingly mysterious terms. It is not—I will come! and no express—Let him be healed! His *indefinite answer*, which He gives without any added promise of coming, includes, on the one hand, a consolation which dispels the fear of death as the issue, but, on the other, it leaves "*this sickness*" to itself, to run its appointed course. Indeed, the concluding words, in their grand, indefinite generality, might have suggested to thoughtful pondering hearers, that some mystery was involved in the apparently plain "*not* unto death." For the *δόξα* and *δοξασθῆναι* had too

lofty a sound for any ordinary recovery or healing. This of itself refutes the unhappy notion of many that the Lord Himself, after the manner of men, expected or predicted a recovery in these words;[1] and Lücke, who inclines that way, finds the *orthodox* exposition (as he calls the presupposition of superhuman foreknowledge, and with more propriety than he himself intended) *more easy*. We do not deny that elsewhere a human expectation or design at variance with the subsequent issue might be possible to Jesus, without any disparagement to His Divinity, and this we have on some occasions maintained in opposition to the general view: but *here*, in this narrative and in these words, it seems a thing more unimaginable the more it is reflected upon. The very beginning, *αὕτη ἡ ἀσθένεια*, with the decisive *οὐκ ἔστι* which follows, has a sound of full assurance, as if He had said:—I know *this sickness*, and its issue, so marvellously redounding to the glorification of God and Myself, full well! (Grotius: Ostendit Christus, notum sibi, quod tanquam nescienti indicabatur.) He knows already everything from the beginning—and this is the truth which pervades all St John's description of His mysterious words and acts. Yet, the more closely we contemplate this first utterance, the more "designedly obscure" does it appear, with all its tone of promise. It is abundantly easy to perceive that, if Lazarus died only that he might be raised again on the fourth day unto the glory of God, this sickness, yea, this brief death and sleep, was not essentially *unto* death in the ordinary sense, unto abiding death. The Berlenburg Bible compares, with pious ingenuity, the passage in the Psalm:—"Thus sings the Messiah, Ps. cxviii. 17, 18, I shall not die—but died nevertheless!" We have here the counterpart of 2 Kings xx. 1, where not only the history records חָלָה לָמוּת (Sept. *εἰς θάνατον*, still stronger than our *πρός*), but the Lord also Himself announces, by the prophet—Thou shalt die and not live! If that declaration of God, revoked through prayer in His Old-Testament condescension, was not untrue, still less is the present word of our Lord, whose "unto death" can and must be interpreted and understood in all its New-Testament

[1] Schleiermacher: Formed an opinion and judgment from what He heard; so that if the information should be found to have been insufficient, His "opinion" also might not coincide with fact!

depth. The same may even be said in a certain sense concerning the falling asleep of all whom the Lord loves, and who will awake only at the first resurrection. But there is no room for the further application which has been made by a spuriously profound exposition, to the sickness of sin—It is not unto death in the case of believers, but to the glory of the Son of God! Such reflections abandon altogether the ground of exegesis.

Unto the glory of God (ὑπὲρ is presently explained by ἵνα): —this promises a wonderful aid, just in the sense of ch. ix. 3. But that this will come through the *Son of God* is *here* made emphatically prominent, though obviously of itself to be understood, because it was to be here made triumphantly manifest that the honour or glory of God (ver. 40) is one with the glory of His Son (ch. ii. 11). Thus it is a testimony similar to ch. v. 23; xiv. 13. The resurrection of Lazarus is the comprehensive concluding symbol of all the miracles exhibiting the glory of God in Christ.

We cannot doubt, though it is not expressly indicated, that this single appropriately ordered utterance was the entire answer given to the sisters; they received no subordinate reply which St John has not recorded. The Lord's dignity discloses itself in the reserve with which, when He *heard* the message, He said these words and no more; and scarcely can we suppose Him to have even added—Tell them this! And what when this message was delivered? Alas, it is highly probable that their brother had in the meantime died! Ebrard assumes, without any reason, that Jesus afterwards went "slowly and circuitously" on the journey, which required no more than a day, from the south of the Jordan to Bethany; and thus he interposes six or seven days between this word and the resurrection. But how, and for what purpose, is this assumed? The reckoning of the days in ver. 6 must certainly be taken in connection with ver. 39, so that the death of Lazarus occurred soon after, if it had not already taken place when the Lord spoke the words of ver. 4.[1] Ver. 5 must at least be as straitly connected with what follows as with what precedes; for the Evangelist confirms the bold ὂν

[1] So Lange, concurring with most expositors; comp. Dräseke's Lazarus, S. 64. This is more simple than Bengel's assumption that Lazarus died precisely when the Lord announced the κεκοίμηται, ver. 11; although this

φιλεῖς of the message by his ἠγάπα, as he continues: nevertheless, when He heard this ἀσθενεῖν of him whom He loved, He still delayed two whole days, after having given the indefinite promise that the Son of God would be glorified in this sickness. We may suppose that He had something to accomplish ἐν ᾧ ἦν τόπῳ, or rather that He was not here, as anywhere, unemployed: but neither the account in ch. x. 41, 42, nor the presently following word of our Lord in ch. xi. 9, 10, leads to the supposition of any specially rich and gracious sphere of activity; the latter passage, indeed, seems to indicate the departure to awaken His friend as His more distinctive work, the commission given to Him for the employment of the little time that remained to Him. So that it is at all events a useless controversy of the expositors which asserts (with Schleiermacher) or denies, that "the Lord would sacrifice to the more particular and slighter necessities of His friends in Bethany, the more general and important necessity of His presence at the Jordan." In the motives of His manner of acting, as in the providence of the Father, many things were at once and together and without any conflict between them considered: but it is most conformable to the sense of the narrative to admit a reference to the great joy which should be in Bethany as the leading motive. His love wittingly delays, that it may more gloriously console them after their sufferings. The sickness and dying of those *whom He loves* is not a matter, generally, of such perilous and urgent moment; and this must His beloved ones in Bethany learn, and ourselves from them; of course there is no room for any *obligation* to hasten to their help, unless other more important matters should prevent. Lavater says somewhere: "Our Lord lets them only *wait*, whom He loved most; His keeping them waiting is just the sign that He purposes to help them in His own way, that is, *as God*." And every candid mind must admit, what it was scarcely necessary for Olshausen to enforce, that the dying of Lazarus was intended to be to himself as well as to his sisters, an occasion of spiritual good. Alford has lately excellently expressed himself thus: "It need hardly be remarked, that the glorifying of the

would give profound evidence of that Divine knowledge of the sickness of His humanly loved friend, which we cannot suppose them to have in any case lacked.

Son of God in Lazarus *himself* is subordinately implied. Men are not mere tools, but temples, of God."

Ver. 7. There now follow our Lord's sayings on occasion of the departure for Bethany, which the disciples had ceased to expect—the ἔμεινεν is recorded only *ex eventu*. Ἄγειν or ὑπάγειν is found also in the Sept. for בּוֹא or הָלַךְ. But εἰς τὴν Ἰουδαίαν, again, is significantly indefinite; He does not speak expressly of Bethany and Lazarus, as if the latter had passed from His mind, or ver. 4 had already said all on that subject. Hence the disciples, thus challenged by the πάλιν, express with more than confidence their suspicions. Thus arises a *further colloquy* with these disciples:—first, the removal of the *hesitation* expressed in ver. 8, and then, the solution of a *misunderstanding* indicated in vers. 12, 13. The disciples were certainly at rest concerning Lazarus, although we should scruple to say positively that "they discerned in the Lord's answer a mighty decree of healing," or that "His words *must* have been understood of His communicating His distant power to save." (Ebrard.) Even on this assumption their object retains something of improper boldness. Νῦν, just now, very recently—the taking up of the stones is still present to their eyes, and they calculate upon the continuance of that enmity and the consequent danger. They had supposed from our Lord's first message that He would not entrust Himself to Jerusalem, and remind Him, as it were, of His inconsistency! They receive a twofold answer: first, in vers. 9, 10, the general composing assurance as to His own action and procedure; and, afterwards ver. 11, a specific declaration of His purpose and reason for going to Bethany.

Vers. 9, 10. These words connect themselves with ch. ix. 4, 5, as the first saying in ver. 4 had been a remembrancer of ver. 3 of that chapter: yet they do not express precisely the same idea, as Rosenmüller and Kuinoel think, and as Teschendorff superficially concludes.[1] Nor is the whole, as has been said, intended *merely* as a rule of life for the disciples; but the Lord first of all expresses the procedure, law, and obligation of His own walk, and in terms which have a deeper meaning than that He

[1] "Nothing is done in the night, because there is no light. But now is My day in which I can work: it will presently be over, and I can work no more. Therefore must I go." Nicodemus, S. 143.

would walk in the daytime! De Wette (S. u. K. 1834, 4, 934) regards as capricious and obscure the view of Olshausen and Tholuck, which enters well into the spirit of the words, but the fault of obscurity as to the profound symbolical meaning of such words, and limitation of their wide range of application, is altogether on his own side. Let us calmly and thoughtfully develop this saying, and we shall not go astray.

Are there not *twelve hours* in the day? This is, first of all, to be clearly understood according to the Jewish custom; for though it remains a difficult problem to the learned to decide whether, and since when, the Hebrews knew or adopted the proper division of hours (the שָׁעָה of Daniel is well known to be indefinite)—it is, on the other hand, tolerably certain that in later times the day, as extending from the rising to the setting of the sun, was divided into twelve hours, longer or shorter according to the season of the year; and Winer appeals to this passage as sufficient evidence. (Article *Tag.*) According to this, our Lord designs not *merely* to speak (as Schleiermacher thinks) of public or concealed walking; for as in ch. ix. 4 the expression "*while* it is day" cannot mean merely "before the eyes of all," so neither can publicity merely be meant here. Wherefore then is the mention and the reckoning of the *hours?* The Lord manifestly first of all designs to signify by the day the time of life *allotted to Him*, before the running out of which He might not and would not cease to perform His works; a meaning which coincides in its fundamental idea, as with ch. ix. 4, so also with Luke xiii. 32. Yet not, as Lücke applies it—I have *only* the twelve hours, and they are nearly run out: but rather conversely—full twelve hours, and the last is not yet come! Bengel: jam multa hora, sed tamen adhuc dies. I walk in My day, that is (according to Hess), "My vocation upon earth has a proper relation to My time." The same Hess (whose expositions, sometimes original and penetrating, are now almost overlooked) excellently paraphrases here: "Think ye, indeed, that that which makes you anxious on My account, can take place one hour before the time appointed of God brings it? As a traveller has his twelve hours for his day's journey, so also to Me there is a space of time appointed for My business; as long as this lasts, I am as sure that no mischance can befall Me, as one

who walketh in the day is *more secure* than he who travels in the night." In which well-weighed comparative *more secure* it is already intimated that the figure does not suit in its rigorous letter. For we ought to be as much accustomed, as expositors of the sayings of the Lord, to this incongruence in His similitudes, as we are to the circumstance that He habitually makes profound and many-sided applications of them.

This last He does here. De Wette is able to perceive that *the light of this world* or the *sun* is not mentioned as a *defence* against evil, any more than the night, on the other hand, can indicate the lack of Divine protection; but that the words have reference generally to some defence and security he also admits, inasmuch as he rightly understands προσκόπτειν (stumble, fall) of danger of mishap, and not directly in a moral sense. Lücke perceives in it moral stumbling and falling, the danger of sin; Baümlein, stumbling against the Divine will! But the disciples had not imagined the possibility of our Lord's erring or sinning through inadvertence; they had only warned Him against danger. We therefore hold fast our conviction (in spite of Luthardt's protest) that He does not justify His own action, but reassure His disciples, in these words. Braune has discerned a further subtile allusion: "I *fall* not under the *stones* of the Jews, *stumble* not against them." *Afterwards*, indeed, in the application which the saying makes to *us*, the simile of stumbling may and must be regarded as signifying that personal guilt is involved. But if the former προσκόπτειν did not speak of external danger at all, where would be the connection between the Lord's answer and the solicitous warning of the disciples? It is manifest, however, that He here extends the simile newly used in chap. ix., inasmuch as He introduces a spiritual significance into the *seeing the light*, the express self-direction according to God's heavenly order of man's day and hour. And He further incorporates a second thought on the same figure: "He does not regard the *space and continuance* of His walking in the day till night alone, but includes the *difference between walking in the day and walking in the night*." (Nitzsch.) De Wette protests against the general significance of this distinction, as pointing to moral purity or impurity, and would rather refer it to "a sincere, open *prudence* in minister-

ing the truth;" but yet he is constrained to give prominence to the moral element too, in order to avoid falling into what he rejects as a "frosty" interpretation, the *mere* injunction of foresight. But whither does this minute precision in distinguishing the thoughts of this full and profound figurative language lead us? The Lord begins by speaking of danger, as far as concerns Himself, and in harmony with the thought of the disciples; but He goes on in the same word to set forth a universal human rule, concerning the morally significant knowledge and avoidance of danger. We may say with Nitzsch: "the *seeing*, *provident*, and *visible* walking" (a threefold meaning at once!), "the walking in the day—is walking in truth and righteousness, manifestly under the eye of God," etc.

But, further, is not Jesus, according to ch. ix. 5, Himself the Light of the world? Assuredly, but He is so only in that He at the same time as man and as Son walks with the Father in His view, lives in the life of God; hence, "I must and can, within My prescribed limits, fearlessly await My vocation in My own and the Father's light."[1] (Meyer.) His βλέπειν τὸ φῶς is partly the *cognitio* paterni propositi (according to Grotius), partly the *obedience* belonging thereto. Walking in the night, unusual to *Him*, would be certainly an ἄτοπον, from which the disciples undesignedly and unthinkingly seemed to dissuade Him by their warning; *therefore* the saying passes over to *this* meaning, to the danger that (*if* He were like ourselves) anything human might befall Him, or He Himself might make a false step. In the former clause He condescendingly placed Himself on a level, in a certain sense, with His disciples and other men (therefore ἐάν τις); but ver. 10 passes over into the opposite (and ch. xii. 35 may be compared with it), according to Olshausen's perfectly correct remark: "the former clause has respect rather to Himself, the latter to His disciples."[2] To discern such na-

[1] "The vocation of a man is the sun in the heavens of his life"—this general proposition, which Dräseke derives from this passage, has its specific application to the Son of man.

[2] Lange (iii. 654), on the other hand, too much: The whole discourse, the whole simile is spoken rather with reference to the disciples than to the Lord. For He begins with Himself as the walker by day, and then sets us walkers by night in opposition.

tural transition and progression in the thought, is by no means to confound different meanings. As the undertone, we hear: Think ye then that I could ever be a walker in the night, mistaking My time and vocation, *as ye might do?* And further: Fear ye not to go with Me! Walk ever with Me and in My light (ch. viii. 12)—as I in My Father's light, which is in Me!

And this, finally, gives us the transition and key to the much contested *ἐν αὐτῷ*.[1] For while Lücke truly says, that He now speaks, not as in ch. ix. 4, of the night in which no man *can* work, but of the night in which no man *should* walk—yet the reason that the walker in the night is without light, must be sought in himself. The figure is now, finally, and most significantly, turned to an inward application.[2] To say nothing of the artificial reference of *ἐν αὐτῷ* to *κόσμος*, philological arguments have been used to remove this peculiar *ἐν*;[3] but these attempts deviate from St John's phraseology, and fail to correspond with the meaning of the Lord's word. Lange discerns the transition, to pursue it no further, when he says: "it is perfectly in harmony with the optical relations of all our Lord's utterances, that He defines the light which enlightens man to be an influence *within him:* hence He terms the eye the light of the body." (This nearly coincides with that of Grotius: *ἐν αὐτῷ*, in oculis ejus, receptione enim lucis et specierum fit visio.) And does not the Lord make the *deepest* view of the figure turn to the inward application? Is it not true of him who by his own fault walks outside his vocation, without the obedient reference to God's will, that is, as here, in the night, that, "without the true light in him, no light shines upon him?" Shine it ever so brightly in the heavens, for his eye it exists not. There is, finally, another interpretation, which Brandt defends: He has not the light (naturally) in himself, he cannot in the night, without light from above, care for, secure, and

[1] Comp. what we have said upon the *ἕξει*, ch. viii. 12, in Vol. iv.

[2] Berlenb. Bibel.: "Here Christ begins an inward application."

[3] And in 1 John ii. 10, *σκάνδαλον ἐν αὐτῷ* assuredly does not mean, as de Wette thinks, coram or in oculis ejus, as *ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς*, Matt. xxi. 42. *Ἐν ὑμῖν* ch. xii. 35 in the plural (which de Wette also adduces), does not by any means prove that *ἐν* stands here for *μετά*. More pertinent is *ἐν ἐμοί*, 1 Cor. xiv. 11 (apud me, בִּי for לִי—but comp. Winer, 3 Ausg. S. 177, 331). The softened *lux ei non adest*, *οὐ βλέπει τὸ φῶς*—cannot by any method be established.

direct himself. This is penetrating and true in itself; but far-fetched as an exposition of this passage. The whole is well summed up, when we understand by walking in the night, according to Meyer's note, "work equivocal and without a calling," that is, rendered culpable by internal neglect of reference to God's will; so that the same work which might and should have been done in God, may be done by him who has not this light without a call, without a blessing, and consequently without protection. This is more than Lange's "prolongation of life obtained by unfaithfulness—haunting the scene—having outlived himself." For the idea of an appointed time, with which the words set out, is now in contrast—since the question is to *know* that time—regarded inwardly as confidence and simplicity of walking:—how *could* any one ever, when his day has ended, thus wander about? There are *hours* of this day, first, following, and last, for distinctive appointed works:—Watch for God's hour, and walk according to it, so wilt thou never suffer harm, and if thou goest to thy death, it will be as thy Lord and Master going to the resurrection of His friend. Only go with Him, even though at first with the mind of Thomas! But if thou regardest man alone and avoidest danger, thou art already wandering in the night, and thy stumbling will surely find thee in thy weak retreating.

Ver. 11. Not till the Lord has given the disciples some time to ponder His previous word, does He give unasked a more distinct explanation of His determination *ἄγειν εἰς τὴν Ἰουδαίαν πάλιν*:—I will go to Bethany, to Lazarus, and, as I said before, in order that God may be glorified in His Son! Whatever doubts may rise as to whether St John has reproduced literally all and every word of Jesus in His later discourses, no man can deny that he has faithfully seized and exhibited the manner and spirit of our Lord's speech. But when we now see how simply concise, how humanly plain and divinely profound, how sublimely dignified, were the utterances of our Lord in connection with such external occurrences as this, we may gain courage to take to ourselves such words—indelibly impressed by their character, or brought back unaltered to memory—as the actual words which proceeded from His lips. (Apart from the promise of the Holy Spirit, John xiv. 26, whether or not referring to the actual letter.) And as to this present word, how entirely and

thoroughly characteristic is it, with all its plainness and simplicity! Have ye then altogether forgotten *our* beloved *Lazarus* and his sickness to the glory of God, and My glory? And would ye not more closely experience the truth and essential meaning of the word which I spake; would ye not sympathise and share in the great event, and see *how* My glory is revealed—even though ye suppose it has been already manifested? Therefore Lazarus is at once mentioned without any preface: a name which would, as it,were, recall to true consideration the fearful disciples. And mentioned with the most affectionate condescension: *ὁ φίλος ἡμῶν* instead of *ὃν φιλῷ*. Bengel: Quantâ humanitate Jesus amicitiam suam cum discipulis communicat! He *sleepeth*—thus the Lord speaks, as if He would make this last resurrection a remembrancer of that first awakening of the sleeping maiden.[1] From all antiquity men generally, and the Israelites, had used this euphemism in speaking of death, yet rather with regard to its outward appearance, and to throw a softening veil over the grave; but this phrase becomes a new and living one in the lips of our Lord, to disclose the great promise which had hitherto slumbered in Himself. We find in Job: *ἄνθρωπος κοιμηθεὶς οὐ μὴν ἀναστῇ—καὶ οὐκ ἐξυπνισθήσονται ἐξ ὕπνου αὐτῶν* (ch. xiv. 12)—but the Lord promises here in simple majesty an *ἐξυπνίσω*. To this end I go! The *πορεύομαι* instead of the former *ἄγωμεν* is naturally thus explained; but it contains at the same time the gentle reproach—Will not *ye* fearful ones go with Me to our friend, to see his glorious awaking?[2]

In this way, for no other expressions at first could have been used, did the Lord speak *περὶ τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ*; and with the design, if not in the sure expectation, that they would at once understand Him aright. Strauss wonders that they did not understand Him; and no wonder that Strauss does so, for his perverse wonder is always at hand. If it had been written that the disciples understood at once, he would very likely have thought that improbable. We rational people reflect that our

[1] Dräseke's reference of the saying to the former words concerning day and night, is needless and inappropriate; for the subject there was a night in which man walks and stumbles, not in which he sleeps.

[2] We cannot see why Luthardt gainsays this. The Lord plainly says—I go assuredly; and in this lies—Will ye not go with Me?

Lord's categorical *οὐ πρὸς θάνατον* would be likely to create such a misunderstanding, even if they had been more accustomed than we can suppose them to have been to such high phraseology. The Lord had promised, as they thought, His healing; and hence they think at once of a favourable crisis followed by a cure.[1] Not merely did the *delay* of Jesus, and the expectation of a coming kingdom for all His friends, prevent them from contemplating death in this case; but the declared promise of the Lord had put it out of their thoughts. And they would indeed be led astray by the circumstance that the Lord designs to set out expressly for the purpose of *awaking* him; but as they are far from any thought of death having befallen the friend in Bethany, they interpret this strange word, as an affectionate, and almost pleasant way of speaking on the part of their condescending Master—And I will see how he wakes up and how he is after his sleep. Or did they (as de Wette thinks), supposing that in the design of Jesus the waking him was to be the means of his cure, reply to their Master—It is altogether unnecessary that Thou shouldst go there for that purpose, as he will already have awaked of himself? I think not, for such a means of cure was never thought of. Nor can I see why Luthardt (who presses my words to their utmost [fast ein wenig scherzende Rede] and forgets their qualification) should so peremptorily reject the idea of the disciples' receiving the Lord's words as a pleasant way of saying that He would go to see how His friend was after awaking. For I still think that if we consider it well, we shall find this view more tenable than Ebrard's supposition that they "knew not wherefore Jesus would *disturb* his beneficial condition of sleep—expressed their surprise that He would rouse him from so healthy a process, *since men are not wont to awake sleeping patients.*" His controversy with this last saying of Strauss has led him too far, for they could not seriously think of a sleep which should last till they reached Bethany. But as the Lord had spoken of going and awaking him, they seem to adopt the same way of speaking which they impute to their

[1] It is so well known that sleep is restorative in sickness (Ecclus. xxxi. or xxxiv. 2), that we need no rule of the Gemara concerning signs of cure, nor any other such learned reference as the hackneyed saying of Menander, *ὕπνος δὲ πάσης ἐστὶν ὑγίεια νόσου.*

Master, and reply—Wherefore awake him? let him sleep on in tranquillity for a while, and thus be restored! Their earnest meaning in the background rested upon the fear and hesitation about entering Judæa and the neighbourhood of Jerusalem which still remained in their minds.

Vers. 14, 15. The Lord resolves their misunderstanding by an answer which meets their words in a threefold way. He opposes to their falsely interpreted εἰ κεκοίμηται the undisguised ἀπέθανεν, which must have fallen upon them as a thunderbolt. As soon, however, as their σωθήσεται is thus taken away from them, the Lord abundantly restores it to them in the assuring χαίρω as regards Himself, which promises and pledges a glorious awakening out of that sleep. Finally, their unuttered, but latent fearful hesitation is put to shame, and corrected by the prediction of an increase of *faith* on their part, so that the ἄγωμεν may now be restored, after πορεύομαι alone had been used in the interval. They who are capable of so thinking may agree with Lücke and Neander, that a second message, announcing, unknown to the disciples, the actual death of Lazarus, is conceivable: for our own part we reject it on every ground. It can find no place in the compact narrative of the Evangelist, who, in ver. 11, says expressly καὶ μετὰ τοῦτο λέγει; for that would be a marvellously long μετὰ τοῦτο after the ταῦτα εἶπε. And it is "an injury to the Divine glory of the Redeemer" to regard Him as speaking thus oracularly and solemnly of a message which He had received, without naming it—more befitting Strauss than the historical Christ. Finally, it is inconceivable that Martha and Mary would have immediately sent the intimation of his death—for to what end? That the Lord might raise him up? We read afterwards that they did not contemplate this, even when He promised a resurrection, when He stood before the grave, when He commanded the stone to be rolled away. Was it that He might comfort and weep with them? Alas, their tone of mind ventured not even upon that, they were absorbed in that one thought—If He had been here—![1] Then, indeed, would they have prayed Him to avert

[1] As it regards any other having brought Him the intelligence—who may interpose such a thought, instead of reading the Evangelist as he intended to be read and understood?

death; then, indeed, death would not have entered into the presence of their Lord. Both these, the more profoundly we penetrate them, give us to understand the Lord's *joy* at that which was their sorrow, viz., that He had *not* been there. The disciples understood it first, Then would He not have been able to refuse Himself to their prayers and to the work of healing—and there is some truth in that. But Bengel's words go deeper: "It is consonant with Divine propriety, that no one is ever spoken of as dead in the presence of the Prince of life. If you suppose that death could not have touched Lazarus in the presence of Jesus, *the language of the two sisters*, vers. 21, 32, *attains thereby a more sublime conception.*" The Lord (as Neander reminds us) assuredly does not say that He had kept aloof in order to allow Lazarus first to die; He rather now *is glad* that, other reasons having induced His tarrying, it had come to that. And this joy expressly witnesses that this turn in the event had not been immediately a design of our Lord. Yet He perfectly well knew all things from ver. 4 onwards.

The ἵνα πιστεύσητε is closely connected, by a transposition of the phrase, with the emphatic δι' ὑμᾶς. Here we have once more the great word *believe:* comp. presently vers. 25, 26, 40. That we should more and more perfectly believe on Him, the Son, in whom the Father is honoured, is not only the end of all that St John wrote, but of all that Jesus did, and of the way in which He did it. In particular, He permitted Lazarus, by not going to him, to die, that he himself, his sisters, the disciples, and many Jews (ver. 45), might believe in Him:—these last beginning their faith, and all the others deepening and confirming it. We may leave it undetermined whether the Lord referred expressly (as Schleiermacher thinks) to their faith in His own so often promised resurrection; ver. 25 afterwards almost induces such a consequence. Spinoza in Bayle is recorded to have said that if he could believe the resurrection of Lazarus, he would break his own system in pieces and become a Christian: but we may reply that, conversely, such a philosopher must first break up his system in order to be capable of believing. Anything like an actual irresistible demonstration that Lazarus was more than apparently dead was not possible even for those who were then present, despite the ἤδη ὄζει of Martha, ver. 39, and

even if their senses had confirmed her words; for the effluvium of sickness and that of corruption cannot in some cases be distinguished. Indeed, as Schubert says, "putrefaction in individual members may consist with the ultimate movements of latent life." As the "system" of Spinoza itself, in opposing all self-deception, rests not upon any incontrovertible external or internal facts, so there are no miracles, inducing faith in Christ, from which, *as φαινόμενα* and *βλεπόμενα*, certain assurance must *methodo mathematicâ* follow. But for him who has come to faith in the person of Christ and the testimony of Scripture concerning Him, in the way indicated John vii. 17, the *ἀπέθανεν* of the Lord's own lips would be better evidence than all the *visa reperta* of the medical faculty.

He is *dead:* and yet—*go to him!* In this last *πρὸς αὐτὸν* is repeated the promise of the *ἐξυπνίζειν* for the *κεκοιμημένος*. But that now, after death is plainly mentioned, the Lord no longer expressly speaks of *ἐξυπνίζειν* or *ἐγείρειν*, we shall resolve, with Grotius (who sometimes is as subtile in his remarks as Bengel), into a *modestia.*

St John does not tell us what either himself, or the other Apostles, thought or said in connection with this word of our Lord; but he records a highly characteristic word of the morbid and hesitating Thomas, equally full of love and hard of faith. He remains altogether in misconception, even after the misapprehension as to the favourable sleep had been removed; but he does not recede entirely into ver. 8. We have *ἄγωμεν* a third time, coinciding with the first and the last word of our Lord. It almost appears as if He would thereby overcome some remaining distrust and shrinking among the disciples:—What remains then but that we follow and be where He is? That *μετ' αὐτοῦ* does not refer to Lazarus needs very little demonstration, though many arbitrarily maintain it. Schleiermacher says correctly, "Thomas and the other disciples belonged not to Lazarus, the individual common friend, but to the Lord. What kind of faith in Christ, and what kind of devotion to Him would it have argued, if Thomas, in the presence of His disciples, could have said that to die with another individual friend would be a greater satisfaction to him than to live with the Lord." Lücke has most briefly and pertinently remarked, that in the *καὶ ἡμεῖς*

spoken to the *συμμαθηταῖς*, there already is contained a *σὺν αὐτῷ*, which is naturally continued in the *μετ' αὐτοῦ*. He is the great Master, and we disciples belong to Him! We may not so quickly rebut the other assumption, that Thomas had so understood the Lord's *ἄγωμεν πρὸς αὐτὸν* as if the way would lead into the other world, where Lazarus then was. (So Bengel, who compares 2 Sam. xii. 13.) We do not declare this at once to be forced, but perceive an accordance between this *πρὸς αὐτόν* and Thomas' words, which cannot be overlooked; though we are less inclined to think that he so expressly interpreted and understood the Lord's saying, than that his troubled thoughts prematurely *imposed* that meaning upon it.[1] Thus are men apt, in such a frame of mind, to dwell upon the last and most mournful word, pretermitting or forgetting all else. Thus Thomas has forgotten what had been said about *awaking!* But Hanstein incorrectly paints Thomas, when he says, "Now that the friend in Bethany was actually dead, and the Master had determined to awake him, to glorify the name of God, any further interference would be indecorous (and not so before?)—and how unkind towards the family in Bethany! He will go now and raise Lazarus—so might Thomas firmly believe (would this 'unbelieving' one believe what *Mary* did not believe?)—but with equally firm assurance that the going to raise Lazarus would be going to Jesus' own death." By this example we warn preachers against neglecting exegesis; and we enter so largely into Thomas' word, because such expressions of the disciples exhibit the then influence of the Lord's words in such a manner as to shed a reflection upon their present meaning and force for us.

Lampe's psychology is at fault when he here asserts: "there is something of murmuring here, in that he does not direct his words openly to the Lord Himself, but spread them secretly among the disciples, and thus sought to fill their minds with disquietude and terror." No, we have not the slightest trace of any such secret murmuring; he does not design to produce disaffection in his fellow-disciples' minds, but to encourage them by

[1] The opinion of Bartholinus (de morbis biblicis) is a curiosity of learning: Thomas was here afraid that they might be subject to the contagion of the body.

his calm ἄγωμεν to obedience. He speaks "without hypocrisy, but without joy" (Roos). There is nothing of disquietude and terror, but all is resignation—such *resignation*, however, as mingles some degree of unbelieving doubt with the devotion of love.[1] Thus much is true, but there is no "cowardice in the words under the semblance of courage," no "alloy of bitterness," as even Dräseke is tempted to think, but the kernel of all is *love* and *devotion*. Thus is he the same Thomas, whose character Hase defines as "melancholy tenderness"—as in ch. xiv. 5 and xx. 25. All must *die*, His dearest friends,—and Himself,—then let us die with Him! Let all go as it may—*with Him to death!* And if all the hopes of kingdom and life built upon Him come to nought—the dependence of love should remain! In such a mingled tone of mind, neither is the desire to die nor the fear of death to be altogether involved or excluded;[2] it remains an indistinct, uncompleted word and feeling, as are almost all such expressions of the various influences upon the disciples' minds, each according to his character.[3] But in the midst of his unbelief, it is the profoundest trust of his heart which speaks, and which will not separate from *Him;* it is this which makes it a prophetic and symbolical word, and therefore it is recorded by the Holy Ghost through the Evangelist John. *We*, who have not merely the resurrection of Lazarus before our eyes, but also the resurrection and glorification of Jesus, should glorify the troubled word of Thomas into a word of joy for the following of our Lord;—as Siegmund has done in his classical hymn, which is not meaningless allusion, but good old symbolism:—Let us with Jesus go—with Jesus suffer—with Jesus die—with Jesus *live!*

[1] Braune: We would ofttimes rather lay us down weary in the grave, than struggle on in the glowing hope of faith.

[2] By which we may correct the assertion of Chrys. in Klee, that the word expresses fear, not desire!

[3] If the Lord's death were the question, they could only *deprecate* it, with Peter; or die *with Him*, with Thomas. (Hofmann, Weiss. u. Erf. ii. 265.)

JESUS AND MARTHA. SECOND FORE-ANNOUNCEMENT: THE RESURRECTION AND THE LIFE.

(Chap. xi. 23, 25, 26.)

It is not by a meeting between Jesus and the profoundly susceptible Mary, that the narrative conducts us towards the sanctuary of this resurrection; but, before that, by His interview with *Martha*, whose soul tarried rather in the outer court of the life of faith. When Mary is introduced, the still procedure of that interview and its most touching utterances are interrupted by the surrounding ὄχλος of the Jews; and thus the intense interest of the situation, in its conflict between that which was most internal and outward things, between the most sublime emotions and the ceremonial of common life and death, is strained to the utmost; and a typical-dramatical scene rises before us, such as belongs to the most beautiful of sacred history. No Evangelist, and assuredly no legend-making church-consciousness (that Nothing which is now after eighteen centuries invented to account for the Gospel narratives!) either would or could have constructed such a history as this if the facts had not thus taken place under the direction of that providence which overruled even the prophecy of Caiaphas, and the evident stamp of which is impressed with increasing distinctness upon events and words, when they approach the μυστήριον προφορικόν of the passion of the Son of God. The pen of John alone, under the direction of the Holy Ghost, could do justice, in all its pure and perfect simplicity, to the narrative which contains the symbol of such a mystery; we might almost say that it was for this reason that the Synoptics passed it over in silence, and left it to him.

In rigorously historiographical form St John first gives the framework around the Lord's words, the essential matter of the whole; and, to this end, he records the state of things which Jesus *finds* on His arrival at Bethany. Thus the εὗρεν of ver. 17 (strictly belonging to ἐλθὼν) refers, in a certain sense, to the

whole down to ver. 21; and by no means intends to say that the Lord now first learned that this was the fourth day since the death which He Himself had well known of. The dead friend is in the grave, many Jews are round the sisters as sorry comforters, Martha first hears of His arrival and hastens to meet Him. The interment, contrary to the early patriarchal and Egyptian custom, took place speedily after the death, probably for the sake of avoiding as much as possible the Levitical defilement. The topographical statement in ver. 18 gives the explanation of the plentiful visitation of sympathisers from the neighbouring Jerusalem, mentioned in ver. 19.[1] Miserable comforters aggravating their deep affliction, are most of them, at least, in this week-long ceremonial of grief. "It seems to have been a family of consideration," as Hess remarks; more subtile is Lange's idea, that "some were the more zealous to be there, as thinking the opportunity favourable for recalling a family, which was well known to be attached to Jesus, from error to the safe way of ancient Judaism." So under the semblance of consolation, ungentle and afflicting reflections upon the powerlessness of Jesus to help might be supposed to have been hazarded: comp. afterwards ver. 37.

At length in His hour He comes, and as *more* than a comforter: He will show them the glory of God, and thereby advance towards His own death. It is obvious enough, and capable of much amplification, that the distinctive character of each of the two women appears in their several deportment, just as St Luke has described it; but we cannot regard it as *immediately* illustrative of character, that Mary does not go forth to meet the Lord. According to Niemeyer, "she does not appear to notice the first rumour of His arrival"—but this seems hardly consonant with the procedure of the event. Schleiermacher says that the report of the Lord's arrival had reached *the sisters*,

[1] Τὰς περὶ Μάρθαν καὶ Μαρίαν, although the formula in Acts xiii. 13 includes companions, seems to us here to designate simply their persons (Gr. οἱ περὶ and οἱ ἀμφὶ), as the Syr. and Vulg. translate. Cod. D. omits τὰς περὶ, and Lachmann gives πρὸς τὴν. To suppose, with Luthardt, that they came to comfort the other attendant weepers also, has something strange in it, even if they are regarded as sorrowful relatives; while to make the αὐτὰς refer to Martha and Mary alone, is still more harsh, after such an interpretation of τὰς περὶ.

but that Mary nevertheless remained behind on account of those who were with her in the house; but this is not to be supposed. We think that the tidings of the approach of Jesus were brought by some one[1] to Martha as the mistress of the house, or, if it be preferred, as the more accessible: of this Mary hears nothing, as ver. 28 evidently shows. It is highly natural that Martha should at once go to meet Him (the ταχύ explains itself); and that she, busied with the entertainment and reception of guests and apart from Mary, should not go first and tell her sister, and take her with her, is equally natural, without having recourse to the explanation that "she *forgot* it through haste." Ἐκαθέζετο is not intended as the simple opposite of ὑπήντησε (as in Luther—blieb Sitzen; or in v. Ess—tarried; as many explain it by the Heb. וְהִשֵּׁב); more correctly de Wette, Kistemaker, Allioli—She sate in the house, and therefore heard not, and therefore came not. This ἐκαθέζετο describes her whole deportment during these days (Erasmus: *desidebat*)—it was varied only by an occasional visit to the grave, and not, as in the case of Martha, by other things. Thus did she this time not find the better part allotted—that of the sitting in sorrow, and giving heed to the condolences of friends.[2]

But let us return to the preliminary colloquy with Martha. Her obscure and indefinite saying, vers. 21, 22, vibrating between lamentation and hope, leads Him to utter the measured and concise answer of ver. 23, which, indeed, absolutely promises her brother's resurrection, but in a general future for the excitement of her faith. But when Martha evasively misunderstands and retreats, He gives her, in vers. 25, 26, a great, decisive, and penetrating declaration—not so much for application to her brother as to awaken her apprehension of that *now present* life which no death can destroy, and of the true *resurrection* in the inmost, spiritual meaning of the word; and *pre-eminently* to excite within her the faith that He in His own person is that resurrection and that life.

What Martha says in ver. 21, and Mary similarly in ver. 32, shows us what had been the main thought of these four days;

[1] But hardly, as Dräseke thinks, by a disciple hastening forward.

[2] Since, as Braune remarks, the condoling friends were received by the members of the family, sitting.

the thought to which all others led, and into which they returned from every other consideration. In the frank truth with which they present themselves before Jesus, the thought of their hearts is the first word upon their lips. "Alas, Lord—we have thought it and said it a hundred times since our brother died"—they must tell Him so as soon as they see Him. Neither of them says—*our* brother; for with all their sisterly communion, each had been individually and in isolation moved by this thought.[1] Thus does poor mortal man look back with *if* in all his heavy trials.[2] The dark mystery of His not coming, to whom they had sent the intelligence and their request, is afterwards expressed by Mary as the simple and sole outpouring of her heart; the less simple Martha, on the other hand, seems to be reflecting at once that the words might appear to involve a reproach directed against the Lord, or a murmuring at providence.[3] Not that she had indeed *thought* of any reproach or questioning, for she says nothing about *wherefore*, and not even—hadst Thou *come*. Of the message He had sent, she does not venture to think, much less to mention it. Did He err this time in His promise —"this sickness is not unto death!" Did He purpose to send the healing power with His word, and did it fail in coming? Such questions concerning the dread mystery had departed, had been fought away, by the time the fourth day came, so that only the question of ver. 21 remained; but now that she had said this in His presence, all those rise again to the quick thought of Martha, and she begins to be *careful* whether He might not so have understood her. Therefore, instead of letting Him speak, she herself continues (a venial unseemliness which Mary's ten-

[1] Martha's ἐτεθνήκει instead of Mary's ἀπέθανε may very well be genuine, in spite of the correction which would make them alike; for such a subtile variation (the force of which we can feel) is quite in harmony with sacred characterisation.

[2] It is wrong, however, to insinuate here a tone of vain wishing: Ah, hadst Thou—then might—! As in the London Heb. N. T. we find לוּ with ; following it.

[3] And it must be considered that the brother, as before observed, might have died before Jesus could have come, humanly speaking. On this supposition, there could not possibly have been any reproach involved; and nothing remains but pure lamentation that He had not been there (as Luthardt says, in opposition to Lücke). Still the lamentation has a tone which borders on the complaining question—Why was it so?

der nature could not have fallen into) and improves upon her own words. And all is perfectly true to the thoughts of her own heart. The sterling expression of great confidence in ver. 22, already seems to border on the Lord's own word, πάντοτέ μου ἀκούεις (ver. 42)—but Martha has not so elevated a meaning, she apprehends the αἰτεῖν τὸν θεόν in somewhat too human a sense (Bengel: verbum minus dignum), almost as if she did not yet recognise in Him the Son of God, like the man born blind in his similar words, ch. ix. 31.

But *what* does she really mean, that Jesus might ask and God would give? It is in vain to wish to remove from the words the hope of miraculous help, *even now* after her brother was dead.[1] Brandt's Bibel: "She thereby only intimates that her faith in Him, and in the special favour with which He was regarded by God, was not shaken by what had taken place. Note well this noble self-renunciation in her faith!" So that she merely meant to say,—Although Thou hast permitted my brother to die, and hast not this time done what we begged of Thee, yet I do not doubt on that account that Thou canst generally ask of God what Thou wilt? This would be a strange avowal, and we feel how artificial is such a connection with ver. 21, without any further refutation. Still more utterly objectionable is Fikenscher's notion that "there is here a continuation of the artless lamentation—Thou mightest have prayed for Lazarus at the right time, and have saved him!" All this is contradicted by the ἀλλὰ καὶ νῦν. What shall we say then? Is it forbidden to refer these words to the possibility of the dead man's being raised, because Martha presently afterwards, in ver. 24 and again in ver. 39, has no presentiment of it? By no means. As she is suddenly bethinking herself to retract the reproach which might be implied in her words, and in so doing recalls the promise of ver. 4, *out of this* rises an instantaneous hope which brightens her susceptible thoughts: she utters her feeling at once, vague through timidity, yet strong enough;—but she scarcely herself knows what she says, in the sudden excitement of her fleeting presentiment. It is, as it were, a return to her earlier hopes before her brother's death, and she seems to forget in her confusion the ἀπέθανε.

[1] As *e.g.* Schleiermacher reads, against the literal words: If Thou hadst been here, God would have given Thee the life of our brother!

Yes, Martha is at this point a heroine in faith—but only for a moment, during the brief continuance of the involuntary presentiment which the Lord's presence had excited: the spark is soon all but extinguished, and the Lord begins to fan it again into life.

Ver. 23. We have fully expounded her long and wavering appeal, in order that the Lord's sublime and concise words in reply may be brought out in all the stronger relief. Schleiermacher's turning it to a *question*,—"Dost thou mean that thy brother is to rise again?" is passing strange, and not worth serious reflection. Ἀναστήσεται comes first, and then follows the sympathising ὁ ἀδελφός σου which *enters into* ver. 21. This, without further entering into her vague expression, is His sole lucid word, *His* first greeting, offered as soon as she gives Him opportunity. Could not Martha, if she received these words as an immediate answer, which they really were, fully understand what He designed to do, what He Himself thought of in so speaking? "Now, if thou dost ascribe this power to Me, I will καὶ νῦν ask that thy brother rise again!" He does not, indeed, say this; or even—I will awake him! Thinkest thou, then, that I cannot do this? or—Yea, verily, the Father giveth Me, as thou sayest, all that I ask! We feel the serene depth of the union of majesty and lowliness in the single ἀναστήσεται instead of all such words. Yes, John, thou hast drawn thy Christ to the very life!—I must confess that I do not share Alford's doubt: "I have to learn whether ἀναστήσεται in this direct absolute sense could be used of his *recall into human life*." And therefore "these words of our Lord contain no allusion to the *immediate* restoration of Lazarus; but are pædagogically used, to lead on to the requisite faith in her mind." But to me it appears that the meaning of the answer in ver. 25, coming home to the immediate present, requires the common interpretation,—that this awaking of *Lazarus* as an exceptional and typical case may well be termed a *resurrection*.

We very much doubt whether Martha speaks the words of ver. 24 as "doubting, inquiring, and hoping."[1] The great unquali-

[1] So Lange, and similarly the Berlenb. Bible: "She would give it to be understood that she would fain know whether the meaning of Jesus' words only pointed to that final day, and whether He would not also show His

fied word *rise again* is too strong for her thoughts to connect it with the *present;* she starts off and declines into the common faith and the common phrase—At the last day. She speaks "half susceptibly, half despondingly"—as Strauss for once well says. Her susceptibility to the Lord's meaning is in fault when she commits by a second *οἶδα* (a word in no case quite becoming in the presence of the *διδάσκαλος*) a yet greater impropriety than that which she had just repaired. "*This I well know*"—and even without Thy new assurance—is her answer to the sublime promise; as if the Master had only administered the current commonplace of consolation! "But what does this avail my life, now bereaved of my brother! It is long till then!" Lampe: "This is a very frequent infirmity of Christians, that they would selfishly wish to bring back their dead to the cares of this life, rather than leave them in the peaceful possession of nearer communion with God." Or it might be said: This is the weakness of immature faith, that it is unable to go beyond the limits of this short life; and that the consolation which can be brought from the last day into the present scenes of sorrow is but faint and unreal. We may indeed, with Lampe, find more excuse for Martha than for Christians of our day; remembering her Old-Testament position generally, and her expectation of the coming kingdom of Jesus—which she would distinguish from the *ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ*. But it may be asked, Wherefore interpret her words in any evil sense? Why not understand them, "Yea verily, I do assuredly stay my soul upon this, that it hath pleased God and Thyself to permit my brother to die." But the *οἶδα* of *opposition* in them does not permit this. The Holy Ghost does certainly in this word of the most instructive narrative mark out a typical expression of that weakness of spirit which itself removes into the far distance the consolation of the Resurrection, and in the lamentation of bereavement declines to take comfort from it. And this requires us to regard the historical truth in her case as corresponding to such a type.[1]

power in a specific manner at the present time." Similarly Lampe, and almost in the same words. Neander also: "This I well know; but I wished to hear something else from Thy lips."

[1] Dräseke: "In the circumstances, this answer would be incomprehensible, if the incomprehensible heart of man did not make it intelligible.

Vers. 25, 26. *These words* are, probably speaking, the centre of the chapter and of the whole history; not the miracle of bodily resurrection, which indeed was to serve for the confirmation of this testimony in the mouth of Jesus, of this reiterated ἐγώ εἰμι, but for which, on the other hand, the Lord would fain have found a preparatory faith, grounded on the word already received.—The right apprehension of the *two clauses*, the remarkable interchangeable expression of which forbids us to regard them as tautological, depends, though this is too often overlooked, upon the right view of the *two words* which precede:—ἡ ἀνάστασις καὶ ἡ ζωὴ is, as it were, the theme, which is then unfolded in two parts. It is clear, at the outset, that the connection requires us first of all to understand bodily resurrection, for ver. 25 aims to surpass Martha's words in ver. 24: that which her languid faith refers to the distant futurity, so that its power of consolation is enfeebled, the Lord offers as in Himself for the immediate present; by His emphatic εἰμί, in the place of the future, and by the impressive question whether she believed *that*,[1] He excites and demands her present living faith in His own Person, as bringing that future time into the present, as making the *Then* no other than the *Now*. "As an answer to Martha the words have the reassuring meaning, I am his (thy brother's) awakener and give him his life again! as we find that He was his awakener, as the narrative goes on, and did actually give him his life again." (Hanstein.) But this meaning of the answer, as sufficing for Martha's immediate care, does not exhaust its meaning, as it involves a deeper principle upon which even her consolation was grounded; still less does it exhaust the depths of this great testimony as intended for all future faith in the speaker of these sublime words.

What relation, then, subsists between the one *double-idea resurrection* and *life?* We cannot say, with Lücke, that the ζωή is the positive *result* of the ἀνάστασις—for that is a too external

Half-faith always does what Martha here does. What one hand gives, the other takes back. What lies straight before it, is sought in the far distance."

[1] Christ here comes forward in the place of the living, life-giving God: comp. Deut. xxx. 20, where Luther probably mistranslates the הוא חַיֶּיךָ; the Vulg. gives it plainly, Ipse est enim vita tua.

sense, even in the case of Martha, whose meaning was to be surpassed; but conversely, the Lord profoundly reveals the life existing in Himself and passing from Him to all believers, as the *cause* and sure *principle* of all resurrection. More correctly Olshausen, "the resurrection is no other than the ζωή in conflict with the θάνατος." Consequently, I am the resurrection, *because* I am the life; further, *as* I am the life, in the same most internally true, and already availing, sense. According to this alone can we distribute the progressive meaning of the two explanatory clauses; in which the Lord proceeds in such a manner as to appropriate *first* the common phraseology and view of *death*, in order *then* to exhibit all so-called death as abolished through His life in the case of all who believe on Him. We may thus embrace the two clauses, with Lange, providing we rightly understand and interpret: "The *dead* will live again, the *living* will never die." But we must be on our guard against narrowing and weakening the former clause! The extreme of this we may illustrate by the words of the paradoxical though generally orthodox Michael Weber, who maintained: The words ὁ πιστεύων—ζήσεται are not a commonplace, but contain a historical *reference to the dead Lazarus, the friend of Jesus;* thus—He thy dead brother, who believed in Me (for it is not said πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων, but ὁ πιστεύων without πᾶς) shall return to life (not in the last day, as thou didst think, but this very day)—; but the words which follow καὶ πᾶς ὁ ζῶν—εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα—, are not to be historically explained; they pertain to all the servants of Christ. Oh no; although there is some truth in this most immediate application to Lazarus, yet we feel that ὁ πιστεύων, even without the subsequent πᾶς, must be spoken in the same witnessing and promising sense throughout chs. v. and vi., the words of which are here, as it were, condensed into a compact epitome. (Ver. 26, especially, is an echo of ch. viii. 51.) How then explain this? The κἂν ἀποθάνῃ contains a condescending admission which is assuredly designed to testify that bodily death, the fruit of sin, is not altogether abolished even by the redeeming grace and victorious life of Christ; but the ζήσεται immediately penetrates much deeper in its preparatory reference to the second clause, being not merely one and the same with the first ἀναστήσεται in the place of which it now stands, any

more than the meaning of *κἂν ἀποθάνῃ* is to be restricted (as in Sepp) to—even if he *have died!* Thus we do not accord with the interpretation of Bengel, however attractive its semblance of profundity may make it: "The former deals with the case of believers *dying before the death of Christ;* for instance, Lazarus. The latter title treats of the case of believers falling asleep after the death of Christ. The death of Christ deprived death of its power. *Before the death of Christ, the death of believers was death;* after the death of Christ, the death of believers is not death."[1] For such an interpretation of the two distinctive periods of the Old and the New Testaments, and of the *ἀνάστασις*, as disclosed in all its fulness of meaning, and in all its power by the Lord's own death, is very far removed from the plain reference of these words in which Martha receives her answer; no such allusion is contained in the *ἀνάστασις καὶ ζωή*, and the *εἰμί* has assuredly no such mysterious *ἔσομαι* in its background. Still less can we distribute the meaning of the Lord's twofold assertion in the way which Klee adopts: "All have their life directly from Him, and as He *here imparts the life of time*, so there He will impart the life of eternal blessedness. The words obviously point to these distinctively. *Ver.* 25 *refers to life temporal. Ver.* 26 *to life eternal.*"

No, the former clause itself passes over, as we have said, into that same meaning of life which is alone its true and essential meaning; that in which the Lord speaks, in chs. v. and vi. as in all this gospel, of *life* in and from Himself, the fruit of His disciple's faith; and we may refer to all that is there said upon the relation between the temporal and the spiritual meaning of the word. It is not to be imagined that *Jesus* would here or anywhere give that name to a *mere* physical resurrection from death.

[1] He boldly added, "It is credible that *all* who at that time saw with faith Jesus Christ, and died before His death, were among those who rose again, as described in Matt. xxvii. 52, 53." We might with equal propriety extend this strange interpretation of the promise in *ζήσεται* (future, death having yet the dominion) to all who before the manifestation of Christ believed in Him as to come, and include their redemption from the kingdom of the dead; we might, similarly, extend it further to multitudes who have gone hence with a like *fides implicita* towards Christ, regarding the second clause as distinguishing from them all who in this life were raised to the full life of faith.

He that believeth in Me—this is His meaning—shall receive at once, in and through this faith, in Me, a life which death cannot invade and destroy; just as, and because, it will be demonstrated that I am *the life* by My conflict with death and victorious resurrection. It is not so much,—Even though he die, he shall *live* again; as,—He shall *live on*, he can never cease to live. On that account it is ζήσεται instead of ἀναστήσεται, and this *of itself* is a denial of the ἀποθνήσκειν even while the word is used; so that the true paradox runs thus,—κἂν ἀποθάνῃ, οὐ μὴ ἀποθάνῃ. "He that believeth on Him, lives even if he dies; death touches not his inmost life, it has become a sleep (ver. 11); and he that liveth and *through faith in Him has been raised up to a new life* can no more be affected by death, *for he lives an eternal and imperishable life which death can do no more than sublimate and perfect.*" (v. Gerlach.)

In these excellent words we have, at the same time, the only correct interpretation of the ensuing καὶ πᾶς ὁ ζῶν, which, strangely enough, the same writer immediately tries to overturn when he says: "in the second half of the clause (*whosoever liveth*) Jesus turns to those *still in life* who were then hearing Him, with a mighty challenge, full of promise, to faith in Himself." The ζῶν of the second clause, which is founded upon that of the first, is ordinarily but improperly regarded as referring only to living upon earth in the common sense. So Augustin. Tract. xlix. Omnis qui vivit *in carne* et credit in me. Euthymius and Theophylact even referred it specifically to the surviving members of the family, in opposition to the already dead Lazarus; and de Wette thinks their explanation at least "not amiss." Then comes Grotius, who finds a Hebraism here: quisquis vivens (vitam hanc mundi scilicet) mihi confidet—as if the Old-Testament כָּל־חַי could be reproduced *here!* Alas, even Bengel takes the same view, misled by the semblance of strict antithesis (as is Alford too): "*that liveth*, namely, this present life of the body; the antithesis is, *even though he die*, ver. 25." But he has failed to perceive that the Lord, after He has gone beyond the *ordinary* meaning and use of the ἀποθνήσκειν by introducing ζήσεται, cannot possibly have returned again to the ordinary meaning and use of the ζῆν. Olshausen's remark is decisive, that if the ζῶν is to be understood of *physical* life, then ex antitheto the

meaning must be accepted that the believer should not physically die. So that Lücke is not justified in denying that ὁ ζῶν implies a continuous resumption of the meaning of ζήσεται. Lampe: Doubtless, the Lord here understands life of the same kind which had been spoken of before, that is, *spiritual* life. The never dying again *follows* directly from the possession of *this* life! The formula might be resolved into a ἓν διὰ δυοῖν: He that liveth through faith,[1] or he that *livingly believes;* still better, the καὶ may be taken as a retrogressive *because*, just as in the previous ἀνάστασις καὶ ζωή. All these reductions to our modern phraseology, however, correspond but imperfectly with the full expressiveness of the sayings in their original oriental-biblical form. The position of the πιστεύων in the *second* place might be regarded as implying the condition that he who had received life in the Lord must preserve his faith to the end; but we leave this to the reader's own feeling.[2] Suffice it, that he who *lives* in Jesus by faith hath in himself the principle of the ἀνάστασις, of the final victory over death; death must lose all its power and be abolished in him. He cannot and will not (as Lange says) "sink again into the essential ground of death"—or in more scriptural language: there is no Hades that can hold his spirit. (Acts ii. 24.)

In these words, "we hear, as it were, a prelude of our Lord's own resurrection." (Herder.) Thus speaketh He on the way to His own closely impending death! But He utters this ἐγώ εἰμι in perfect devotion to the πιστεύοντες; He promises also *to them* that which is sublimely self-understood in relation to Himself. Nothing distinctively appropriate to Lazarus is contained in the sayings of vers. 25, 26; the promise that he should rise again retires before a far higher and comprehensive truth to which the Lord would elevate the doubting, faltering Martha; He turns her attention from her brother lying in his grave to Himself, the present life-giver, the present resurrection of all who be-

[1] Theod. Mopsuest. ὁ ζῶν μετὰ τῆς εἰς ἐμὲ πίστεως.

[2] But when Luthardt says, in his frequently too rigorously literal style of criticism, that no expositor but Stier would find in the position of πιστεύων the condition of living in faith to the end, I may remark that Lange's interpretation of the second clause is essentially no other: "But in as far as *faith* has become effectual in his life" (only mine is more precise, faith has become his true life), "there is no more death possible to it." (iii. 656.)

lieve. Not, however, that she is to resign the hope of an immediate, present fulfilment of the promised ἀναστήσεται ὁ ἀδελφός σου—she is encouraged firmly to expect in faith towards Christ a most glorious realisation of *this* assurance. Hence the οὐκ εἶπόν σοι of ver. 40, points back to these words.

Believest thou *that?* That is, that *I am* the resurrection and the life? Then shall it be found true in the case of thy brother, who believing in Me, and as My "friend," has died! Her answer shows that Martha thus rightly understood the indescribably penetrating and mightily stimulating question. But we, when we read it, must think of the multitudes who avow and even preach that Jesus is the resurrection and the life, and who, nevertheless, properly speaking, *believe* it not, or only languidly believe it. It is for their sakes that the Lord here once for all uttered that gracious, but piercing and convicting question—Πιστεύεις τοῦτο; that it might for ever penetrate all such unbelieving hearts. His own resurrection has now put its profoundest emphasis upon this question. Thus, though no Lazaruses may be any longer raised up, and we are left at the grave to seek our consolation in the last day, yet the Lord gives us here to understand what is the true "*resurrection*," and shows that it is to be experienced in the new life of His believing saints. When the dead bury their dead, leave them at first to their cries and lamentations until the claims of that anguish are satisfied; and then let the voice of a preached Gospel sound into the sorrow, it may be to the awakening of the dead who are burying their dead. But when the living bury *His* living—nothing should be heard but resurrection-joy, no traces but of that should be left! *Should be*, only that our faith is often but too weak in the midst of the sorrows of death! It is for us to strengthen it for ever by the great truth—"I am the resurrection and the life!" the comforting power and the convincing force of which can never be sufficiently either expounded or felt. When the angel Jehovah at the burning bush called Himself the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, the living God of all who had died in peace but who still lived to Him, that was indeed a great word, but it was spoken out of the darkness, and its assuring truth could burst forth into life only after the passing away of more than a thousand years. But here the great word in the lips of Jesus is

mightier still, and is spoken out of the light itself; for here stands that same covenant angel, the eternal Son as man in *our body*, on the way to die for us in the grave of humanity; and He graciously asks for our faith in His—*I am He!* All other grounds of immortality and longings for resurrection life receive their realised confirmation only in the firm faith in His person and His word—*I!* And here we gladly bring to mind the words of Ullmann, coming from the very heart of faith, where John Paul's saying, "were there no other, yet Christ is Providence!" is repeated and raised to higher grandeur—Were there no other, He must be the resurrection!

THE SEPULCHRE, THE STONE, FAITH, THE THANKSGIVING TO THE FATHER, THE RAISING.

(Ch. xi. 34, 39–44.)

Martha's answer, with its earnest, though only half understood confession, may be compared with that of Simon Peter (ch. vi. 69); there is something more of evasion, however, in her case, since she does not understand the "living though he die," and the "never dying," even so well as Peter did the words which had been spoken concerning the flesh and blood of the Son of man going up again into heaven. In both instances, meanwhile, the gist of the confession is,—Even that which I cannot understand must nevertheless be quite true, for one thing is quite certain to me, that Thou art the Son of God! As the man who had been blind promised Jesus beforehand that he would believe on the Son of God, because he already more than suspected Jesus to be He—so do such souls as Peter's and Martha's believe (in their several way) beforehand in that *eternal life* of which the words of Jesus speak, without comprehending all at once the when, the where, the how, or the secrets of God's power in the *resurrection* which precedes. The first *yea* of Martha, consequently, is spoken with absolute subjective truth, although she does not know that she is uttering it very much as the disciples did in Matt. xiii. 51. Indeed, Martha does no more believe in the full meaning of the τοῦτο of the

Lord's question, than the disciples there understood all that He had been saying to them; but the ὅτι σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστός which she avows instead, admits and includes all that He would testify and do as such. She marks out His person in her confession by the three several predicates which were known to her;[1] to the general popular term by which the Jewish expectation was expressed, she adds the declaration which was but obscurely if at all apprehended by the Scribes and learned of the day, that that Christ was also the Son of God; and both are conclusively supplemented by the ὁ ἐρχόμενος of expectation now fulfilled. This is not, indeed, as Luther has it,—Who is come (Vulg. venisti); but as always,—Who was to come; yet the σὺ εἶ includes His having come, and hence Erasmus gives it best,—qui venturus *erat*. It is not now that she begins to believe all this; but the πεπίστευκα means actually that conviction which the Lord knew she had long felt, and which prompted the *first* κύριε of ver. 21, although then in ver. 22 her hesitation had not permitted her to use τὸν πατέρα instead of τὸν θεόν.[2]

And now she is prepared; she pauses not in contemplation, evidently has no repose of mind for any longer continuance in such high words and things. Quasi re bene gesta she becomes Martha again; she bethinks herself of the propriety of summoning her sister, forgotten before in the hurry of her going forth to meet the Lord, and expresses that snmmons as if it was a direct commission from the Master. We by no means think, with most people, that Jesus had actually spoken any such words (Pfenninger: "Where is thy sister?"), for St John would have related it. But she thinks, what the Master now speaks is rather

[1] "Her fervour and energy of mind had brought at once into combination all that was said concerning the Saviour, all the three tokens and signs of His character." Braune. This is quite true. Luthardt (i. 122) imputes *to me* the exposition, that Martha would swiftly despatch the matter, and therefore said at once all that she could say, *not* tarrying in the believing contemplation and adoration of the person of Jesus; but this is one instance among many of his own habit of swiftly despatching his notice of my meaning. Where have I said this?

[2] Hezel, who understood by the last day of ver. 24, "the Messianic period after the termination of the Mosaic," would thence prove that that period had been still far in the future to Martha, and therefore again that she had hitherto not regarded Jesus as the Messiah!

for my sister[1]—and regards His presence and His thus speaking as an indirect calling for that disciple who had been so peculiarly susceptible to His instructions. *Therefore* we have now διδάσκαλος instead of κύριος.[2] She calls her secretly, in order to prevent the concourse of Jews, who were in part opposed to Jesus, and whose presence certainly would be, in her estimation, an interruption. *Mary* came *quickly;* and this is mentioned only in her case (without altogether denying it, however, of Martha's ὑπήντησεν), because the double fact, that Jesus was there, and that He had to send for her, gave wings to Mary's haste. Jesus remained without, He had not at once gone, nor did He now go into the house of mourning, nor even into the village; He would doubtless avoid encountering at once the multitude of guests; but did not aim, as Hess assumes, to secure as much privacy as possible for the performance of the intended miracle. For He well knows that Lazarus is in his grave, and that many comforters would be there, the inevitable witnesses of the resurrection. Consequently, we prefer saying with G. Müller, that, "at the raising of Lazarus, He seemed to make it His aim, for the satisfaction of all the demands of His enemies, to perform this most wonderful of all His miracles in the most public manner possible."[3] Comp. ver. 42. And in this both ancient and modern expositors concur. "He repaired immediately to the neighbourhood of the *grave*," as Lange tells us, deducing this rightly from the circumstance that in ver. 31 the Jews understand Mary's way to Him to be her way to the grave. And if anything is perceived in this contrary to the

[1] She cannot sustain the force of this great declaration. It is too much for her. Then began she to find her need of her hitherto forgotten sister. Mary must hear this. It was for her above all others. Dräseke.

[2] "They have no other Master; and this friend of the family is thus sufficiently designated." Braune. Ita solebant inter se loqui de Jesu. Bengel. Here again I am at one with Luthardt, although he charges upon me the idea that it was *merely* in allusion to the previous distinctive relation of Mary to Jesus as hearing His words, that διδάσκαλος is used. This is doing me injustice.

[3] Vom Glauben der Christen, i. 401. Dräseke derives the same from Jesus' own word—I go that I may awake him; and adds, "The Hero cannot be absent from the scene of his exploits."

custom which required that the mourners should be visited in the house, it makes the specific design all the more obvious, and this is the meaning of ver. 30.

The miserable comforters will not allow the poor bent mourner to weep as heretofore, alone at the grave; they persecute her, as it were, with their unfeeling presence and sympathy. And she herself has no other word for Jesus at first than her sister's;[1] but more simple than Martha, *she* adds no apologetic reflection to the expression of their common grief and perplexity; instead of that *she* falls in full devotion at His feet, which says much more than Martha's hastily satisfied reflections; she understands her own words in a much deeper sense—"Yea, verily, where Thou art no man can die!" It goes to her very heart that He should have had to send and summon her, and this it is which throws her in the profoundest lowliness of dependence at His feet.

Ver. 34. The simple word here spoken by our Lord springs, according to St John's report, from a strong emotion, the precise definition of which has given great trouble to the expositors, and especially to those who are themselves deficient in that penetrating sympathy with the occasion which alone leads to a right understanding. We must not shrink from a close inspection of this *ἐνεβριμήσατο.* All whom Jesus now sees around Himself are weeping—good and bad, friends and enemies—for the sadness of death overpowers them all.[2] But it was when He saw *Mary also* weeping that the measure of overpowering influence upon even the Son of God in the flesh was full—what an exquisite feature in the picture is this! Of what nature, then, is His emotion? *Βριμάζω, βριμαίνω, βριμάομαι, βριμόομαι,* all from *βρίμη* (power, strength, anger, threatening) signify in their derivative meaning, to be angry, to rebuke, to threaten, to express vehemently, quite corresponding with the Latin *fremere.* Hence *ἐμβριμᾶσθαι* here assuredly indicates a *gravis animi com-*

[1] Luthardt adds, "it is probably not immaterial that *μοῦ* is placed first in her words, while in ver. 21, on the other hand, it is only appended to *ἀδελφός.*"

[2] Thou art ashamed to *weep* beforehand at the thought of thy own coming grave; but would not that be better, more profitable, and more sincere than merely the common weeping with those who weep?

motio, which it is vain to require our understanding *in sensu molliore.* Vulg. infremuit; but the Heb. New Test. incorrectly וַיֶּאֱנַח. (In Isa. xvii. 13 for גער Symm. has *ἐμβριμᾶσθαι,* Aquila *ἐπιτιμᾷν,* —in Ps. xxxviii. 4 for זעם both have *ἐμβρ.* In New Testament see Matt. ix. 30; Mark i. 43, xiv. 5.) Since, however, anger, at this time of general weeping, appears hardly consonant with our Lord's character, recourse has been had to a subordinate meaning, "to mourn;" and Olshausen precipitately declares this sufficiently established by its correspondence as to this twofold meaning with the Hebrew זעף! This last may be true (see Tholuck) in itself, but it decides nothing as to the Greek usage; since we cannot find in the LXX. *ἐμβριμᾶσθαι* used for sorrow, though we do find in Lam. ii. 6 *ἐμβριμήματι ὀργῆς* for בְּזַעַם־אַפּוֹ. The old Greek expositors of St John understood in mass no other than the being angry; Lücke admits this invariability of the usage, although he afterwards decides for "a *sadness* bordering on displeasure." We agree with Lampe, who condemns the multitudes of expositors whom Grotius represents, "who *confound this* indignation of our Lord with His *tears*"—and maintains his own well-grounded protest, sed obstat constans verbi usus. For the word was never regarded by the old standard lexicographers as having the twofold meaning of anger or sorrow; and this may be observed beforehand against Lange's opinion. Thus, vehementer indignatus est. Strauss in this case is quite right, It is an emotion of anger and not of grief. But wherefore? Not because of the enmity of the Jews who flocked round according to the petty interpretation of Michaelis, Storr, and Kuinoel, who seem not to have read the *ὡς εἶδεν* of ver. 33. Nor is He angry with the weepers because they weep in their weakness, for that is opposed to the gentle love which always accompanies our Lord's majesty; and hence we find no *αὐτοῖς* added. Cyril and Euthymius (see in Lücke) referred it to an internal process of self-conflict, in which the Lord vehemently repelled and suppressed the strong sympathy of His human nature which disturbed Him. But *τῷ πνεύματι* is not to be taken as a dative, marking the *πάθος* which the Lord rebuked; for this would be to oppose the meaning of the word *πνεῦμα* and to forget the parallel *ἐτάραξεν ἑαυτόν.* Nor can we by any means understand that the emotion which our Lord might suppress, could be the

pure and holy sympathy of grief. We trace, however, in these ancient attempts to find the object of this displeasure in Jesus Himself, the right clue to that meaning which alone we regard as the true one. And that is *almost* the same (for in the definition of deep feelings individual expressions are not easily adjusted) with Lange's view, which corrects his former opinion:[1]—a strong feeling of voluntary counteraction to the mighty influence upon Himself of the tumultuous scene of sorrow. But Lange should have said (what others also omit) that Bengel was upon the same track.[2] It is assuredly something akin to a temptation, which springs from the mere lamentation over unconquerable death around Him, and would almost hurry Him away; for He must be regarded as carrying His sympathy with every human impulse, even to the very extreme edge of what was lower than Divine. Thus it is not over the weeping of these weepers alone that He is moved and incensed in His inmost being, where Divine thoughts and impulses take the form of human ideas and feelings—but over human misery generally as at that time exhibited, over the bitter death-lamentation of a world of sinners, but especially, as scarcely needs to be asserted, over that essential misery in misery, death in death,—*sin*, and that as specifically here, *unbelief*, which will not and cannot apprehend any resurrection at all, yea, the same unbelief in His beloved believing ones, and even of His most beloved *Mary!* Brückner properly says, "It is the holy indignation of the Redeemer, misapprehended by His enemies, and misunderstood by His friends." This must be included, though the central emotion was *sorrow* on account of *sin*, and wrath against *death* as the wages of sin. Luthardt (S. 217) not only coincides on this point with Besser, but even with myself; why then should he oppose what obviously belongs to the truth which he admits, the displeasure at

[1] In the fourth volume of his miscellaneous works. He there decided for a mixture of anger and sorrow; justifying the former, and approximatively interpreting the whole aright. His finding sorrow in the ἐμβριμᾶσθαι was contrary to the genius of the language.

[2] On ver. 33. "Thus it was that, by a more severe affection of the mind, Jesus here restrained His tears, and presently after, ver. 38, broke off His tears; and, by that very fact, the influence produced by them was greater." On ver. 38. "By this groan Jesus *also* repelled the Jews' gainsaying, *lest it should tempt His own mind.*"

Mary's unbelief and the blindness of His foes? Much various emotion is involved, indeed, in the depths of our Lord's sensibility at this time. How much more profoundly than that of man does it penetrate the *principles* and reasons of emotion! Again, He is not so much indignant at the horrors of death as something alien to Himself and confronting Him from without; but His holy wrath is called up by the *sympathy* by which He at the same time as man stands within the sphere of this humanity. Thus must we interpret, not this crisis simply, but the whole conflict and victory of the Son of God in His weak, tempted flesh: this is the truth lying at the foundation of the exposition which makes ἐμβριμᾶσθαι to mean sympathy. If that which excited His indignation did not so closely and intimately press upon Himself, why the passion of repelling vehemence? But the fellow-feeling with such misery is presupposed; St John's words give only "the resentment of the power of death"—as seen, too, in unbelief of the glory of God! Thus, as Lange saw at first, in the background wrath against Him, who holds this power of death over man! That here, according to Kling, "sacred indignation and most inward sympathy coexist," that He, according to Pfenninger, was "moved deeply and with indignation," must assuredly be understood. This rather than B.-Crusius' question, "Is it not according to analogy that sympathy should precede active communication of help?" For the Godman cannot be thought to have been angry at wickedness otherwise than as that anger was connected with that grief of His sympathising, redeeming heart of which Mar. iii. 5 is the normal text. This intermingling of emotion is attested in Lu. xix. 41–44, and in our present passage by the tears which afterwards flow.

It is in this feeling and passion,[1] into which the Lord is moved, even while He voluntarily and consciously surrendered Himself to it,[2] that He asks the question, *Where have ye laid him?* The

[1] Our readers will not require us to defend further the position, that (according to Rothe's Ethik 1, 303), "an instantaneous pathological passion might find place even in connection with the most perfect normal moral development."

[2] For this is the subtile modification of St John's ἐτάραξεν ἑαυτόν; admitting whatever measure of truth there is in the old orthodoxy which denied any mere passivity to the Godman.

traces of the emotion which accompanied this were visibly and physically to be seen; but the Evangelist explains to us what He really was τῷ πνεύματι. Either the Lord does not know the specific Ποῦ of the sepulchre, which is not supposable after what has been said, or the question was designed to announce beforehand what He had determined to do. Assuredly the latter, although He was not so understood; and this anew excites His indignation. He does not say, the body; but αὐτόν (just as ver. 15), in order to intimate the continuous unity of the man in body and soul even after death, confirming, in spite of all sophistry, this natural mode of expression.

Now first the *come and see!* bids the hitherto pent up *tears* overflow; now first does indignation against the γενεὰ ἄπιστος, and the power of death which would seize even His own spirit, resolve itself into the gentler *sorrow*. This ἐδάκρυσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς has been made a verse of itself, with the pause of סֶלָה after it![1] St John also has given the clause its isolated position; this and nothing else befel, on His part while going to the sepulchre, the Raiser went on His way weeping. The *sorrow* of this lamentation over death has its divine propriety in this, for death is the wages of sin. That marvellous orthodoxy which would make Jesus weep merely as an example needs scarcely to be mentioned even in warning.[2]

Vers. 36, 37 exhibit a twofold influence upon the Jews of the sight of Jesus weeping—a better and a worse. The one part errs half in good-nature; the other with an admixture of malignity. That He had loved him, is indeed true; and ver. 36 gives us a beautiful funeral text at the grave of the friends of Jesus, encouraging us to place His love to the deceased above our own. And we may more truly say: How did He love all us men, when He could be angry and weep at our unbelief in His gift and grace! Ver. 37 must be more closely observed. Strauss captiously asks, why they say nothing about earlier restorations to life; and the answer which lies most immediate

[1] Although it would be very incorrect to say, as Nonnus does here, that Jesus very seldom wept—ὄμμασιν ἀκλαύτοισιν ἀήθεα δάκρυα λείβων.

[2] Basil. M. hom. de gratiarum actione (Opp. II. p. 29): οὐκ ἐμπαθὲς ἦν τὸ δάκρυον τοῦ κυρίου, ἀλλὰ διδασκαλικόν. Dräseke, on the contrary: When His eyes thus overflowed, the Son of God was, in the fullest sense, Man.

is this—Those were Galilæan reports, and not so firmly established in the faith of the Jews as the recent healing of the blind man in Jerusalem. Further, no man ever ventured to demand of Him a resurrection from the dead; even Martha and Mary, who must have heard of former instances, dare not hope this for their brother—now four days dead! and surely we cannot attribute to the unbelieving Jews more faith than theirs. Teschendorff goes too far when he says, "they interjected their hissings, just like the serpent which leaves its venom even on beautiful flowers;" but we certainly perceive the traces of malignity in these perverse reflections. They cannot imagine any help now after death; but on that very account their objection (which is the open expression of what Martha and Mary kept in the background) goes back to a former time, and asks wherefore He should allow matters to reach this extremity in the case of those whom He loved. Wherefore did He not so order matters that this man should not die? And now He is constrained to pour forth tears at the grave! The first and most rational thought would be, He must have willed this, loving him so much; therefore in this case He *could* not effect it, this sickness passed His power! But instead of uttering these first reflections, which are to be taken for granted, they give expression to another springing from them, and which leads them astray:—To open the eyes of a man blind from birth is more[1] than the cure of any kind of sickness—*ought not this man to have been able?* And this would have a twofold meaning: either involving a reproach of neglect, or (as, since Euthymius, it has been generally understood) that they speak *εἰρωνευόμενοι* and mock His impotence, *ἀδυναμία*. Klee, holding this latter meaning, says, "They designed thereby to bring that other miracle upon the blind man also into doubt; if He could not save this man, what may we not think about the healing of the blind man?" This would be, in genuine irony, the perfect reverse of what they say; but such intense bitterness, in the midst of universal weeping, seems to us to be psychologically inappro-

[1] Lücke, correctly: "in fact, ver. 37 should be rather an argument *a majori* than *ad majus*." But we cannot so easily admit the reference to their regarding the excitation of an apparently dead man, a case frequently occurring, as less than opening the eyes of the blind.

priate; and the reference to this utterance of the Jews seems to us more certainly to be a supplementary testimony to the truth of that admitted miracle.[1] Finally, ver. 27 might be regarded as a well-meaning but feeble echo of vers. 21 and 32, Alas, if He had come, if He had been here at the right time! Wherefore *could* He not, or *should* He not (in the mysterious adjustments of God) have been here with His timely help? But this suits not the rigorously interrogatory form in connection with the striking *ἠδύνατο*, nor the contrasted *τινὲς δὲ*, which seems to be intended as *ἄλλοι δὲ* elsewhere.

Ver. 39. Suffice it that this superficial interpretation of His tears, shed not merely over Lazarus, and the unbelief connected with it—this *οὐκ ἂν ἐτεθνήκει, οὐκ ἂν ἀπέθανε*, now become the third time *ἵνα μὴ ἀποθάνῃ*, nothing but death and the indissoluble bonds of death in the thoughts of all—excites in the Lord yet another emotion of displeasure rising above sorrow.[2] Thus prepared by these blended and alternate emotions,[3] He reaches the sepulchre; rather, *εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον*, that is, He advanced into the interior, broad opening of the great cave, in the narrow background of which the corpse lay, concealed by a stone laid before it. The human *shuddering* at that death which by Him was to be overcome, being put into His power; perfect sympathy with that anxiety of the sorrow of His most believing and most beloved friends, against which their faith in Him has to struggle; deep indignation at the perversion and folly of those opposed to Himself; all this had occupied His mind, to such extent as it was possible for His soul to be so

[1] Thus did I plainly express myself. Yet Luthardt opposes Stier's notion that these Jews did not acknowledge that cure and the miraculous power of Jesus! Why did he read so cursorily, and attribute to me an opinion which I quote only to reject?

[2] Schleiermacher, indeed, thinks, "that the Redeemer was too much engrossed in His own thoughts, and the deeply mysterious connection of the event which was about to take place with the Divine plans, to pay much heed to the remarks which were being uttered around Him!" Oh no, the Lord was never so entirely wrapped up in His own thoughts; even on the cross He gives heed to every word and every movement around Him.

[3] Weeping and anger alternated in the bosom of Jesus at the sepulchre of Lazarus, within the space of a few moments. Kleuker.

occupied: Then said He—*Take ye away the stone!*[1] What majestic *composure*, and self-possession in the midst of this mighty emotion! Step by step He approaches gradually the great act, in order to qualify the amazement of poor mortal eyes on beholding the glory of God. He *might* indeed have Himself commanded the stone to roll itself away, as a mountain or a fig-tree; He might even have commanded Lazarus to come forth through the impediment of the stone. But the miracles of God avoid with the supremest propriety all that is superfluous. "What men's hands might remove, He commands *them* to take away." In His dignity He had let the confused remarks pass in silence, as previously the words of Thomas concerning dying with Him; but now shall the act itself speak and give answer whether it was the death of His friend alone that had made Him weep, and whether He could or could not succour him from death.

Among the Apostles a presentiment doubtless arose of what was now coming; Mary assuredly understood for what and how He would take away *the stone* from death and the sepulchre. It was only the careful Martha, ever anxious about circumstances, who could blindly suppose that He only desired to see the body once more: therefore she opposes to the Lord the frightful idea of its corruption. We leave those who are so disposed to contend whether this ἤδη ὄζει was merely the supposition of Martha (the following γάρ being thought decisive), or a historical intimation of the effluvium which actually penetrated through the stone. Certainly we cannot permit ourselves to adopt in the translation the words of Stolz, "By this time he assuredly stinketh!" We shall not enter into the needless question whether the revivification of a decomposed body would give to the miracle a *monstrous* character, as Olshausen thinks; nor examine Lange's positive assurance[2] that the Lord on this occasion had designedly suspended the process of decay. We cannot be

[1] "With what tone, we may imagine"—says Br. Baur, mockingly, on account of the indignation. Yes, indeed, we can imagine, but very differently from this frenzied mocker.

[2] Who thinks, with many, that the ointment of chap. xii. had been designed for the embalming, which had been left unaccomplished.

assured whether Lazarus stank or not;[1] but this we do know, that the power of God in Christ, which at the last day will bring together all the scattered members of the body, would at this time not pause before the slight commencement of decomposition. Thus we best adhere to the simplicity of the Gospel narrative, without in any way confusing the economy of the Son with that of the Father, who might be regarded as alone the *Creator:* for in every miracle God doeth a new thing (Numb. xvi. 30), so that the pretended limits are quite indefinite to our view.[2]

Ver. 40. "Graciously, and yet with some slight displeasure," the Lord speaks (as Pfenninger thinks) this word, which now takes the place of His tears. Once more He is moved, though more gently; and now gives His own explanation, and in the most condescending manner, of the predominant reason of His anger. It is the *unbelief* of even His believing followers while under the ban of visible *death!* He had said that faith should behold the glory of God, especially in ver. 26, so also in ver. 23, and yet further back in ver. 4. The expression δόξα τοῦ θεοῦ is derived from this last quotation, and the Lord's words mean, generally,—Have I not told thee from the very beginning, promised thee again and again! But by this repetition the simple clause becomes a new, great universal truth and promise

[1] It is to us, however, more probable "that the Evangelist reports the cause as it really was, making Martha's statement his own"—quoting the language of Br. Bauer for once, who on this chapter generally gives full scope to his harebrained malignity. De Wette regards it as in the highest degree improbable that the body *was not embalmed*, considering the eminence of the family and the provision for the purpose actually existing in the house; but it seems to us natural enough, when we remember the hope which had been entertained to the last, and the prostrating revulsion of grief afterwards. For this reason we cannot think, with Lange and Luthardt, that the ointment (chap. xii. 3) had been bought for Lazarus; nor that the embalming had been deferred from day to day till Jesus should come. Was Jesus to confirm the actuality of death? or did they *expect* the ensuing resurrection? Assuredly not! Vers. 21, 22, refute all these suppositions.

[2] Thus the "difference between the new-creating resurrection at the last day and the actual vivification of the old mortal body" (which Luthardt blames me for overlooking), is not so rigid and definite, but that this singular and pre-eminent instance might anticipate in some sense, and be an example of the former.

—that, everywhere and always, faith, especially in the presence and amid the tokens of death, shall see the glory of God! What an inexhaustible, all-comprehensive text is this for the preacher! The great condition, as it is here laid down first, is, and must ever be, faith. Unbelief, even that which, alas, still more or less clings to unbelievers, but especially unbelief in its absolute sense, *seeth* indeed something, but only what comes before its bodily eyes. It may be that it sees only the wretchedness of man's human life, and that horror of death which ends it with presentiment of something worse;—or, still worse, turning wilfully away from that view of things, it may contemplate the glory of the flesh, as if it would never fade, the glory of the world, as if it were a reality and not a delusion;—or, worst of all, it may fix its proud regard upon *its own* imagined glory and might. And yet, what is all this but the *stone*, which falls at last crushing upon the grave and the poor spirit within; the stone which Christ alone can remove. But faith already *sees*, after the manner of its own higher, and more assured seeing, something beyond all this, even the glory *of God:* and that in a manifold sense. First of all, even that glory of the Creator which is still upon and in the world, the *ἀΐδιος αὐτοῦ δύναμις καὶ θειότης* which is yet to be seen in spite of sin and death—the token and prophecy that the ban and curse is not irremediable, that the kingdom of death is not absolute upon the earth. (Wisd. i. 14.) Then, as faith in Him who is come, it sees the glory of the Redeemer, of Christ in His kingdom, His church, and His spreading Gospel. This, indeed, goes beyond, it is no other than an actual *ἀνάστασις* of the spirit into life which everywhere conquers and banishes death. And this seeing faith has the promise of exceeding greater things; of beholding and experiencing that final quickening and glorification unto victory, נֶצַח (Isa. xxv. 8), of which the restoration of Lazarus from the grave was but a slender pledge. But the *sure foundation* for such faith is after all no other than *His word.* Is it not enough that *He hath said it?* And in His love how often has He spoken it: after every minor and preparatory fulfilment pointing back to His own words, to shame and elevate His weak servant—*Did I not* say unto thee?—But how deeply rooted in us is unbelief! Was it possible that the Raiser of Lazarus could re-

main in His own grave? Yet did not He, who predicted His own rising again on the third day, find it needful to demonstrate in His own case the truth of His own reproving question? They none of them believed, John no more than Thomas. (Ch. xx. 9.) Yet He rose again among them and for them; and from this we learn that the condition ἐὰν πιστεύσῃς is not so rigorously intended: but the beginner and finisher of our faith strengthens, rewards, and consummates the weakest faith which He beholds.

Thou shalt see the glory of God; that is, with joy, for thyself —for in the end even unbelief *must see*, though only to its guilt and condemnation, even as the Lord's enemies see with their own eyes the miracle wrought upon Lazarus. In the most immediate sense, notwithstanding its profound prospective reference onwards to the last day (ver. 24), the δόξα τοῦ θεοῦ is here, as in Lu. ix. 43, used in the sense of μεγαλειότης; compare, in Ex. xvi. 7, the same expression used for the revelation of the might of His unshortened arm. The glory of God is that power which victoriously protests against every appearance upon which unbelief has fixed its eye: in the present case against the conviction of the dead man's *corruption*, as expressed by Martha in words which may serve as the protest of men's senses everywhere against the resurrection.[1]

"He whose mind is biassed against the narratives of miracles in the Gospels, and generally in the Bible, would regard this as a good opportunity for Jesus to put an end once for all to the faith which rests on signs and wonders; instead of calling back a dead man to life, He might more profitably have occupied the company with pious discourse upon death and life, time and eternity, and have thereby annihilated the hopes of all who, then as afterwards, might demand miracles as evidence." (Hess.) But not so! He performs the miracle as a testimony; He stoops to the weakness of existing faith, or to excite faith where it existed not, and gives a "rehearsal of the great scene," when all the "corrupted members of humanity shall again be reconstructed in perfect harmony." (Kleuker.)

[1] B.-Crusius: "The word of Jesus in ver. 40 stands in opposition to the Jewish (wherefore merely *Jewish?*) abhorrence of the grave and its contents. Here there is no revelation of death, but a Divine revelation of power to be expected."

Vers. 41, 42. But in connection with this last great public miracle the Lord utters a declaration which holds good of all His miraculous acts,—intimating, first, their proper design to lead men to believe in His person and mission; and then giving instructions as to the instrumental means by which He acts in the power of God. It is not as the ancient dogmatic, and the opinion of many of the pious concurring with it, think:—that the man Jesus accomplishes His wonderful works in the immediate possession of almightiness; but He performs them, like man, through prayer and faith. This alone is in harmony with His state of humiliation; and the difference between the miraculous working of others both before and after Him and His own, consists in this, that He alone is absolutely and supremely full of faith, and always heard as the Son of the Father. "He did, indeed, effect all His miracles in faith, but in that faith which was quite peculiar to Himself, as being the Son of God manifest in the flesh." (Rieger.) Kleuker, after having so profoundly spoken of "the Son of God and of man," nevertheless embarrassed himself by saying (Mensch. Versuch, S. 238): "Jesus did not pray for an impartation of higher strength from heaven, for *where He was, there was the Father*, and all life and power: but He prayed, that they might believe that He was sent of God." Oh no, He did here, as well as in all His miracles (comp. Mar. vii. 34, and our exposition), pray the Father that He might now make manifest in Him and by Him His power. Indeed, *this* prayer of Jesus in its sacred mysteriousness was never audible to man, many times it is presupposed and wrapped up in His instant word of power. And, generally speaking, every *petition* of the Son to the Father—apart from His youth-development, and the first and last conflict (in which He yet more profoundly empties Himself)—must be regarded as rather an expression of *thanksgiving* for being certainly heard already. So here, it is not now that He prays; but, in His supreme dignity and truth, thanks His God for the hearing of the prayer which must be placed as far back, it may be, as ver. 4. He had received even then the answer from the Father as to the issue of this sickness.[1] The supposition

[1] Hence we cannot, with Albertini, term this, which is no longer supplication, a "heaven-enforcing prayer."

which some have most erroneously hazarded, who connect this present thanksgiving with the Lord's observation of Lazarus' life when the stone was removed,[1] is protested against at once by the words which immediately follow, by the ἤδειν and the Evangelist's declaration that the Lord refers to His prayer and thanksgiving for the people's sake alone. In order that they might not, beholding the omnipotence of God thus exhibited in His wonderful work, idolatrously *worship* Him, thinking Him man, "as a God" (see our remarks on ch. x. 34–36)—He himself prays as man to God, and gives as the Son to the Father His honour. This was a testimony, prominent and conclusive, given to Him before His final sufferings; and therefore the ὄχλος περιεστώς is not sent away, as in the case of the *first* raising from the dead. For all things have their time and order.

It is with difficulty that we condescend to the unfounded objection which has been urged against the *praying for the sake of the hearers*—an objection which Strauss, an incompetent critic in anything which concerns prayer, has carried to its highest point of offensiveness.[2] Our Lord's declaration, that He thus prayed and gave thanks on account of the people, has, alas, always been more or less repulsive to many:—a sure sign how few are able to place themselves with simplicity in the position from which our Saviour's life can be profoundly understood. Dieffenbach even resorted to the expedient of supposing an

[1] Being embarrassed by something like the opinion of those whose theory here is that of a seeming resurrection:—He now saw that Lazarus was not dead, and that He could "awake" him in the presence of the people!! Chrysostom and Lampe, with others, assume the revivification to have taken place before the εὐχαριστῶ σοι, but this we must reject. Alford rightly regards this as "highly improbable;" and, referring to ch. v. 25, 28, regards ἀκούσαντες ζήσονται as being the physical as well as the spiritual order of things.

[2] To him, such prayer of cold accommodation (as he chooses to term it), such an *acting* of prayer, is repulsive and hateful: and so we suppose would be the most internal prayer of the solitary child; for what does he understand of praying, to whom every address to God as independent of the spirit of man must be an offence? Br. Bauer outdoes his predecessor, babbling here of a "prayer which explodes in irony upon itself," and other monstrosities, not here to be quoted, which carry enmity against St John's Gospel to its most fearful excess!

interpolation. Lücke, who does not scruple to regard the addition ἐγὼ δὲ ᾔδειν as a reflection of St John, and seizes this opportunity assiduously to vindicate such half-unbelieving views of the Evangelists' composition, admits that praying aloud in no case excludes reference to the edification of others. This incontrovertible commonplace requires no confirmation to the minister, who feels in all his liturgical prayer the propriety and obligation of keeping this reference in view; nor even to the Christian priest in his household who prays in the presence of his children and dependents. Lange speaks with much dignity and felicity upon this point, showing how much the critics are below the height of this prayer, and that perfect filial supplication, being without all restrained and vehement inwardness and exclusiveness, may in its simplicity reflect externally upon the present hearer. Did not the Lord pour out the prayer of ch. xvii. to the Father, with a view to the disciples who should hear it?[1] Did not the Father Himself, ch. xii. 28, 30, answer the Son—not for His own sake, but for the sake of the people?

But the real element of difficulty in this application, one which de Wette thinks "must be acknowledged," lies in this, that the Lord Himself says it in His prayer to the Father—I pray for the sake of the people! But we must reply that in this is exhibited the transcendent simplicity and truth of Him who had become man for us, who lived, who taught, who worked, who prayed for us; so that not only was the "for you!" of His whole life never in any opposition with any "for Me," but according to the very nature of His *mission* He is constrained to give perpetual testimony to this. And this extends far beyond the analogy of the priest in the household praying in the presence of his family! In the high-priestly prayer, ch. xvii. 13, the Lord utters before His disciples the same express declaration—that He *spake* His prayer for their sakes—which He now utters before the people.[2]

[1] So that this of ch. xi. is not to be regarded as "the only public prayer of Jesus."

[2] Thus it is certainly not to do away with an objection, that I would follow Münchmeyer's counsel to explain artificially (with Baumgarten-Crusius and others, which he does not add), as if in εἶπον an earlier supplication were referred to: For the sake of the people I uttered the request!

And what a crisis was this, for the establishment of the appeal to the Father in the presence and for the sake of the people!—bringing to mind Elijah on Carmel, praying to be heard, "*that this people may know* that Thou, Lord, art God!" (1 Kings xviii. 37.) But how much more important this moment! "The sign here to be given was to decide upon the truth of His life, as far as concerned the circle around Him"—says Lange. Hanstein, yet more strongly: "Then stood collective humanity waiting in spirit at the grave of Lazarus. And the great question—whether God would hear or would not hear His only begotten, whether He would authenticate or desert the work of Christ, whether He would confirm or bring to nought His once-uttered word—must *here* be decided!" Rhetorical, indeed, but founded upon truth; for in the ὄχλος and in the ὅτι σύ με ἀπέστειλας the Lord Himself feels and indicates the historical as well as the typical-prophetical significance of this moment, of this glorification of the Father in the Son through the coming forth of the dead at the voice of the Son of God. Understand —εἶπον, Therefore was I constrained to say it, and that Thou knowest! Ebrard's well-meaning remark, "herein lay at the same time a request that the Father would impress the event upon the hearts of the people, and draw them to Him," is not in itself to be quarrelled with; but we would prefer to omit such a reflection from the sublime εὐχαριστῶ σοι, in which He, conscious of His own glory from the Father and in the Father's sight, rather expects than prays for the subsequent faith of all who were susceptible of faith, and, as it were, gives *thanks* for them already by anticipation.[1] And this is He, who Himself after a few days goes to His own death, Whom they decree to kill because He raised from the dead!

Vers. 43, 44. In regard to what has His Father heard Him? That He would cause that this dead man should be dead no longer, but live again and arise? and that now before our eyes? Yea, verily, then will we believe! But how will, how can such a thing be? The Lord, unexpectedly even to the thus matured

[1] "Thus He thinks not of His own honour, only of the people's believing, by which they would be saved." So Braune with a good meaning, if rightly understood; but the salvation of those who believe reflects back again, on the other hand, His own glory.

expectation of the people, *at once* utters the awakening word in its simplest expression. And *with a loud voice:* assuredly, for the people's sake again, that every one may hear; as well as on account of the dignity of the moment, in its typical significance as a prelude of the final voice at the last day. Then was that brought to their eyes and ears, of which the church afterwards sang: Tuba mirum spargens sonum, per sepulchra regionum, coget omnes ante thronum—mors stupebit et natura, cum resurget creatura, Judicanti responsura. *Κραυγάζω* is more than *κράζω* (ch. vii. 37)—it is used here only concerning Jesus; comp. Matt. xii. 19, *οὐδὲ κραυγάσει*: see the expression elsewhere, Matt. xv. 22; Jno. xviii. 40, xix. 6, 15; Acts xxii. 23. This loud call, at the same time, is in suggestive contrast with the magical whisperings and murmuring incantations of unholy traffickers with death—as the remark of Grotius intimates, non magico susurro. (Comp. Isa. xxix. 4, viii. 19, the צְפָצֵף in connection with the לַחַשׁ). But how runs the loud word? Not, Thou dead one, live again! Nor, Arise! as elsewhere; but, instead of naming the *grave*, it is merely *ἔξω*, merely a gracious summoning *δεῦρο*. Just as it might be spoken to the living, *as if the dead were not dead.* Had he then been already revivified through the Father's answering might,[1] and was this call not properly the awakening call, and *this* not the moment and crisis of the miracle? By no means: for this would go counter to the unity of the Father and the Son; it would oppose the plain expression afterwards used—whom He *called* from the dead into life! Against this testifies the analogy of קוּמִי, Mark v. 41, *ἐγέρθητι* Lu. vii. 14, as well as the *ἀκούσαντες ζήσονται* Jno. v. 25, 28, to which we have already with Alford referred.[2] We think that the sophistical distinction, in connection with this sublime reality, is as ridiculous as the contest upon the twofold truth—Jesus rose again, and the Father raised Him from the dead. The Father had already given Him to perform this work, so that He can by anticipation give thanks; at the same time, never-

[1] Lampe: ex quo nostra hypothesis, qua credimus, Lazarum ante eucharistiam Domini vitam recepisse, non parum constabilitur.

[2] The immoderately paraphrastic Nonnus sets out quite correctly here with *λιποφθόγγοιο δὲ νεκροῦ ἄπνοον ἐψύχωσε δέμας νεκυσσος ἠχώ.*

theless, the Father giveth it to Him now first at this moment to perform it through and in the Father's power.

He that was dead comes forth *immediately:* not, as is usual in waking from deep sleep, gradually aroused, stirring himself, reflecting, and setting himself free. He who thus depicts the scene to himself, misses its sublime truth. It was *the dead man,* as he had been before death, sound as before his sickness; Lazarus himself, given back once more to earthly life; for indeed —"Christ could (and would) restore men as they had been; because they must be again what they had been in mind and function; not glorified men after the fashion of Moses and Elias, for such would not have been for an earthly life." (Kleuker.) An old legend preserved in Epiphanius (Hæres. 66, 34) informs us that Lazarus was then thirty years old, and lived afterwards other thirty years, and this might seem to harmonise with internal propriety. We cannot positively decide, in relation to Lazarus, that the souls of those who were raised by Jesus had never passed into the final actuality of death, into the full consciousness of another state. Though they, "according to the plain description of all the Evangelists, awake as from a sleep," this does not decide that "Lazarus had nothing to tell of another life." This last we fully believe, because the lifting of the great veil by means of individual persons would have been opposed to the whole profoundly planned economy of God; because the design of these resurrections was only to manifest the glory of God, and not to gratify an improper curiosity as to the concealed Hereafter. But to that end the remembrances of the returning man might be blotted out; though we cannot unconditionally deny that Lazarus *might* have *related* in deep secrecy something to his sister Mary or to an Apostle. In all these mysteries we are bound to silence, even as the Scripture is silent.[1]

Lazarus *walked,* when he was under the mighty enforcement

[1] This, in allusion to Ebrard (S. 401), who too boldly maintains that "all the dead who were raised by our Lord, although their souls were separated, and their bodies beginning to undergo corruption, are manifestly *distinguished* by this declarative κοιμᾶσθαι as still capable of being awakened, as not having come under *all* the relations and consequences of death." For does not the Apostle speak in precisely the same terms of the dead at the last day?

of the call of Jesus to come forth; that is, he moved as well as he was able: he could not at once walk perfectly, not, however, through want of strength, but because the *κειρίαι* hindered him, and the napkin upon his face prevented his seeing. Thus much we gather from the simple narrative. We are not sure what was the custom among the Jews of that day, in the *περιστέλλειν τὸ σῶμα* (Ecclus. xxxviii. 16); and the *τοὺς πόδας καὶ τὰς χεῖρας* of the text does not decide whether, as in the case of the Egyptian mummies,[1] each foot and each hand, and each finger was wound round. We cannot therefore assert anything positively on the question of the motion of the bound man. The simplicity of faith once thought that there was here (according to the expression of Basil) a *θαῦμα ἐν θαύματι*, a moving where moving would have been otherwise impossible; nor is there any sure ground upon which this may be contradicted, and the controversy upon it is as needless as in the case of the *ἤδη ὄζει* before. For our own part, as we were there inclined to think that St John declares through Martha a fact, so we here think that the *δεδεμένος*, almost parallel as it is with *τεθνηκώς*, and strikingly contrasted with the *ἐξῆλθεν*, indicates something wonderful, and according to appearance impossible. One who was *δεδεμένος τοὺς πόδας*, taking the expression in its simple meaning, could not ordinarily move; and we have no sure ground for lowering its meaning, any more than we have for understanding the *ὄψις* of the forehead merely (though the word is certainly so used, see Jer. iii. 3, Sept. for מֵצַח).[2] Some prefer to think that the enveloping was but loose, as the embalming was to come afterwards, and that in moving it became still looser; against this we offer no argument, but *to us* the word of the Evangelist and of Jesus seems to intimate another meaning. For the rest, the restraint and wrapping in which the dead man first comes forth, contains an allegory capable of discreet application to spiritual quickening. The relics of the grave which still hang around our limbs and face are to be removed by the Lord's appointment through the further ministries of men.

Not without awe and dismay to the beholders did this coming forth take place. The first aspect of the corpse returning to life

[1] Whose custom the Jews followed, according to Tacitus. Hist. v. 5.

[2] See Klee's intelligent note upon this.

was spared to them through the human provision of concealment; but sufficiently fearful was the appearing of the enfolded form, the sudden conjunction of all the apparatus of death with the realities of life.[1] But we must not overrate this, as Teschendorff does, who makes even the sisters fall at the feet of Jesus, crying, "Lord, Thou dost astound us to death!" who speaks of the blank horror of all hearts (of Mary's, John's, and Nathanael's?), indeed represents the hollow voice of the dead man interposed, "Who has called me forth? Wherefore left ye me not in my slumber? And art Thou here, O Master! I long tarried for Thee. Joy to me that Thou art here!" Such human additions serve only to make more impressive the simple silence of the sacred narrative. Pfenninger better represents the diversified influence of the scene upon the general multitude: "A hundred voices broke forth in cries of amazement; a hundred hands were stretched forth to the everlasting heavens; hundreds sank down upon their knees; hundreds smote upon their breasts; hundreds stood as if petrified—among these last the sisters themselves."

The Lord alone was serene and collected, as if nothing unusual had occurred:—this is testified by His final word, in contrast with the silently intimated excitement of all the rest. It is no appearance, but the living Lazarus—venture therefore to approach him and *set him free!* Not only does he live, but in all his vigour and soundness—hold him, therefore, and lead him no further—*Let him go!*[2] As He before caused the stone to be removed, so now human hands are to do the rest; He Himself at first lays not His hand upon His friend. Without His commandment, pointing to their most natural and obvious duty, no one would have dared at once to approach the moving man. By the *loosing*, the restoration to life was completed and confirmed, as by the food given in the case of the maid; and "Lazarus was now brought to contemplate himself." He was to ὑπάγειν, that is, to go to his house, where he would have time and place to utter his thanksgiving and show his love. The multitude should not then dis-

[1] No human eye, at His resurrection, beheld Jesus in His *apparatus of death!*

[2] Lange: "Hold him no longer, as if he needed support. Nothing more is wanting but to release him from the external bonds of death; the internal are broken already."

quiet him by looking and touching; they were not even to go with him, but ἄφετε ὑπάγειν. This applied to all who had come around Mary and Martha, to the ὄχλος περιεστώς; and the first word λύσατε was indefinitely spoken as an appeal and command to the multitude (αὐτοῖς). Who executed it, what further was spoken or done in the house, whether the Lord Himself went with them immediately or first spoke to the people, or whether (as is most probable) He *at once* retired and concealed Himself, as ver. 54 seems to intimate afterwards—the narrative informs us not. The Evangelist has recorded the great event; and now hastens, with sublime brevity, to the general consequences of this miracle.

The τινὲς δέ, ver. 46, are certainly *not* believers, as they were to whom they are opposed;[1] and now Lu. xvi. 31 is strikingly fulfilled. The glory of God is before their eyes, but is not seen. *The things which Jesus had done* are not maliciously denounced to them, but reported indifferently; and in the high council held thereupon, their "deliberations begin in the most unadvised manner." The Son of God remains to them οὗτος ὁ ἄνθρωπος! The πολλὰ σημεῖα do not divert them from the idea that *they* must do something in order to prevent His being thus left alone, as if this lay with them. They feared that all men were believing on Him, that is, would accept Him as King and Messiah, so that then *their* dominion would come to an end. *This* is their especial fear and prompter; but in their hypocritical sanctity they seem to impose in some degree upon themselves, and, devising a pretext as such evil ones holding counsel together with some remnant of shame are wont to do, they speak of the Romans. That τόπος (according to 2 Macc. v. 19, comp. Acts vi. 14) signifies, first of all, the temple, and at most the holy city in

[1] Some have very inappropriately interpreted the ἐξ αὐτῶν, which certainly is used with reference to the previous ἐκ τῶν Ἰουδαίων, as if it signified some *of those who believed!* (So Braune, who points to the dependence of these believers upon the authorities.) The δέ intimates a contrast; and Alford very properly observes, that this Evangelist, who is very consistent in his use of particles, carries onward the manifestation of the glory of Christ by οὖν, whereas δὲ generally prefaces the development of the antagonist manifestation of hatred and rejection.

addition, must be held fast as phraseologically correct, in spite of Luthardt's contradiction;[1] while undoubtedly the expression passes over afterwards into a similar common phrase, such as Luther translates, "Land und Leute," land and people. (Nonnus: ἔθνος ὁμοῦ καὶ χῶρον.) The Romans, indeed, had the land already; but they had hitherto spared the rights of the sanctuary, and the freedom of the *people* (ἔθνος differently from λαός afterwards).[2] All this these hypocrites regard as endangered, if this Messiah, who is no Messiah, this wonderworker, who yet will not contend and save Himself, should proceed a little longer on His course. We may spare ourselves the trouble to disentangle the foolish confusion of these thoughts; Caiaphas pronounces the true judgment upon them—ὑμεῖς οὐκ οἴδατε οὐδέν. But what better, then, does he know? Cunningly enough relieving the scruples of many; and yet with a proud dictatorial tone, as if commanding the reasons of all, he helps the assembly to the issue of all their thoughts. Are we to have done with this one man? To speak plainly what we have all long wished—*Let him die!* (He, who has just raised from the dead, or whatever else was the truth in this new σημεῖον.) That is the better, instead of a destruction of the whole people. And if he is no more than an innocent enthusiast, who commits nothing worthy of death, let him be a political sacrifice, ὑπὲρ τοῦ λαοῦ.[3]

In *this* word even the mouth of Caiaphas is constrained to prophesy. Although in spirit he is no other than *one of them*, he is yet by office the *high priest* of this great year, in which, on the true day of atonement, the typical priesthood and sacrifices ended;[4] the last of those high priests, many of whom irregularly ruled only for single years. That a *popular sentiment* at that time ascribed to the office the gift of any, even unconscious pro-

[1] Who too critically supposes that the αἴρειν, to take away, wrest from, is only applicable to the territory, and not to the temple.

[2] Neander paraphrases correctly: the Romans will make this an occasion to take away from us all *that they have left.*

[3] We doubt much whether, as Münchmeyer says, λαός and ἔθνος are used promiscuously in Scripture.

[4] Compare Luthardt's excellent exposition, i. 87 ff. Alford does not admit this significance in the expression, but understands the words to refer to some official distinction from Annas (the high priest de jure), the exact nature of which is lost to us. But this has force rather in ch. xviii. 13.

phecy, cannot be proved, and is rather improbable; for Philo's subtilties do not represent the people's faith. The Urim and Thummim cannot be appealed to here, since (as Lange says) it was only the decisive vote of the high priest in theocratic questions generally which was thereby signified, and not any distinctive expressions or oracles; and, further, they had been long extinct in practice. There is here no "relic of Old Testament faith in Urim and Thummim" (De Wette), but something very different. St John explains to us that Caiaphas here prophesied, and that as high priest; and this has its justification and warrant in the dealings of God from all antiquity,[1] and especially in the history of His Son upon earth. As Pilate, the representative of this world's power, was constrained to *bear witness*, in the superscription upon the cross, of the *King;* so must we regard it as a grand *irony of a most special Providence at this crisis*, that the retiring high priesthood should unconsciously and involuntarily by its last representative speak of the true *sin-offering*. Thus St John rightly discerns in these words of political expediency, a *ὑπόνοια* imposed upon them by the Spirit; yet he himself extends and corrects the limitation of *ὑπὲρ τοῦ λαοῦ* (for which he sets the explanatory *ἔθνους*), and carries us back to the Lord's own word, ch. x. 15, 16.

The decree of death is decided. Jesus knew that His consummation was appointed at the paschal feast, neither after nor before; He therefore withdraws after the manifestation of His glory; and, further, the concourse and tumult of those who had become believers compels Him to depart. For this faith was, certainly, as Braune strikingly says, on the part of many "simply a faith in which the understanding did not say no, but the heart did not yet say yes." We know not with certainty, even after Lange's disquisition, where Ephraim or Ephrem was situated. But by the report of the excited suspense of the people —*ὅτι οὐ μὴ ἔλθῃ εἰς τὴν ἑορτήν*;—the Evangelist prepares the way for all that follows, the secret and undisturbed anointing at Bethany, the public tumultuous entry into Jerusalem, the last catastrophe.

[1] De Wette groundlessly maintains that prophesying with a double meaning is altogether foreign to the Old Testament. (Stud. u. Krit. 1834. 4. 937.)

THE ANOINTING AT BETHANY.

(John xii. 7, 8; Matt. xxvi. 10–13; Mark xiv. 6–9.)

We cannot harmoniously arrange this exposition of the Lord's discourses otherwise than by giving undividedly the whole of what St John so characteristically records down to the end of ch. xvii.; although the sixth part of the work must commence anew with the Synoptics concerning the preparation of the paschal lamb, and then join with St John in the details of the imprisonment and the remainder. We therefore renounce the special harmonistic adjustment of the last discourses in St John; much difficulty attends it, the solution of which subserves but little our understanding of them. In this distribution, which leaves each Evangelist as much as possible in his own propriety, we have already closed with Matt. xxv., Mar. xiii., and Lu. xxi.; *now* we encounter *in St John* the anointing, which St Matthew and St Mark record in another place; and we shall of course introduce them as parallels.

From Ephraim (if we reconcile them all) the final way of our Lord is to Jerusalem through Jericho, where He heals the blind men, and enters the house of Zacchæus; His sojourn in *Bethany*, before He provides the ass and rides upon it, is to be inserted at Luke xix. 28. Not that this plainly coincides with every expression of the synoptical narrative, for each Evangelist simply records what the Spirit makes prominent to himself *for his own plan*, unconcerned about the day and the hour, and such other petty circumstantials as so much embarrass our modern historical criticism; but, on that very account, we also unconcernedly regard as perfect truth in essentials everything which each Evangelist records. St John, always precise in his chronology, where he gives it, assures us that the anointing in Bethany took place *six days before the Passover;* consequently the old supposition must be true, that St Matthew and St Mark insert the same incident *retrospectively*, in order to indicate the occa-

sion of Judas' betrayal and thence of the Lord's imprisonment at the feast at the same time suggestively—to place this "anticipation of the burial" at the commencement of the history of the passion. Our readers will take it for granted that we are fully acquainted with all the subtleties of controversy which has raged around these circumstantials; but they will be well content with our well-weighed opinion merely, as we hasten on to greater matters. We think it most probable that Jesus came to Bethany on the Friday evening, at the commencement of the Sabbath, that He might spend one calm Sabbath there before the entry into Jerusalem; the meal will then be rightly placed on the Saturday, on the Sabbath itself.[1]

He had obviously not been there again since the resurrection of Lazarus; it is highly improbable that any express *invitation* had induced Him to come, for their profound reverence would permit them only to wait for Him. But when He had come, and that on the Sabbath, their thankful devotion ventures something more: *they* provide Him a festal repast—that is, the faithful disciples of Bethany (Lampe: quod numerus pluralis suadere videtur). And it is quite in harmony, that according to St Matthew and St Mark, this δεῖπνον was in the house of one "Simon the leper;" obviously, as Chrysostom remarked, one healed of his leprosy,[2] and is it not obvious again, healed *by* Jesus Himself?[3] As a thankful memorial he retains the name of his former humiliation and sorrow, that is, among the disciples; just as Lazarus is called here, ὁ τεθνηκώς, ὃν ἤγειρεν. The former expression must not be lightly given up, with Teschendorff: it evidently belongs to the full-toned description. Among the living and eating was *the dead* and *risen again*: the Evangelist does not so speak for the sake of a petty confirmation

[1] Luthardt places it on the Sunday, which does not appear established by his data, nor consistent with the Sunday-entry. Neander holds it the last and best solution of the difficulty, to fix Christ's coming to Jericho on the Friday.

[2] For it is a most marvellous supposition, devised by some, that this was a *family name*, after the manner of the Romans in their Claudii, Cæci, Balbi, etc.!

[3] An old legend makes him the father of Lazarus; and some glosses are to be found which convert him into the husband of Martha!

of the miracle, but to depict the scene in all its significance, as we find still more evidently in ver. 2—εἷς τῶν ἀνακειμένων evidently indicates, at the same time, that he in this house was a guest with other guests. Silent, and solemn, and self-involved we may suppose this dead man restored to life for a long time afterwards; certainly so now in the presence of Him who raised him: between the raised Lazarus and the healed leper the Lord probably sits as between two trophies of His glory. It needs no explanation that Martha finds means to serve, even in a strange house, where she might serve *Him;* but Mary (whom St Matthew and St Mark mysteriously call only "a woman") shows herself in all her greatness, in the still, internal glow of her love to Jesus. She honours and anoints Him, as her heart prompts, with all the magnificence and costly tribute which is in her power. St Matthew and St Mark term the vessel *ἀλάβαστρον*, as we find also in Luke vii. 37: and this might be (according to Pollux) a term for any vessel containing unguent, or *μυρηρὸν*, as Theocritus Idyll. xv. 114, *signs* of *golden* alabaster boxes of Syrian ointment. The costliness of the *μύρον* (a general name for all sweetly-smelling fluids) is made prominent by each of the three Evangelists: for the same reason St John gives the weight. It was *nard*, celebrated in all antiquity, and also in the Old Testament (where נֵרְדְּ, however, occurs only in the Canticles) among odoriferous ointments; but as to the *πιστική*[1] (which, however, is a specific term, since two of the Evangelists agree in its use), we may say in the blunt language of the Berlenb. Bible: "we leave others to trouble themselves about it, who love to meddle with such matters; and who are

[1] Nonnus retains *πιστικός*, but scans the middle syllable long. Vulg., in St Mark, has nardi spicati (but in St John pistici), hence many have assumed a transposition for this Latin word (Kistemaker: of ears of nard). Others interpret it, drinkable or liquid; and Fritsche prefers this. But most probably it is, according to the later Greek usage (in Aristotle), quod fidei est exploratæ—thus *genuine*, Indian, not Pseudonardus, as Pliny says (Theophyl. *ἄδολος*, Euthym. *ἄκρατος*). The Syr. ܦܝܫܝܬܐ points that way. Others have derived it from the name of a place—but without grounds. And what more is wanting? The word in its precision serves to assure us of the historical truth of the occurrence. Sepp (iii. 175, note), following Friedlieb's Archäologie der Leidensgeschichte, has treated the question very learnedly.

wont to weary the brains of the people about them, instead of setting them forward on their great pilgrimage, showing off at the same time their learning and great reading."

Breaking the vessel (probably only above the neck, hence the Syr. in St Mark has וּפַתְחָהּ,—and opened it; but probably also for the sake of pouring all forth more quickly) she anoints not the Lord's head merely, but in the superabounding fulness of her love and humility, as St John significantly supplements, His feet also, which she wipes with the tresses of her hair. All sprang from the deep, unhesitating impulse of love, the symbolical expression of mighty emotion. St John remembers that the house was full of the odour; and mentions this not without allusion to Cant. i. 12. "As if her soul would pour itself forth as a sacrifice of sacred love and faith,"[1] but, alas! not all hearts are full of the sweet odour, or enter into the spirit and meaning of her beautiful act. Even in the circle of the Apostles there is murmuring blame; for this scent is odious to the nostrils of the traitor Judas. It is a false view to regard him as only sharing the sentiments of all. (Dräseke, "and he murmuring concealed himself behind the others.") That he, on the other hand, was the *originator*, St Matthew and St Mark do not indeed expressly say; but they plainly hint as much in the connection (not otherwise discernible) of this with his immediate departure to the high priests. He may have begun gently, and the other disciples, "whose love was not yet much acquainted with the external developments of love" (Niemeyer), suffer themselves too easily to be led into concurrence. For "censure infects like a plague" (Berlen. Bib.). Could we but know the wicked origin of many of the judgments which we thoughtlessly echo, the Judas-heart from which springs many of the current criticisms of books and of things—how should we recoil from them! Made bolder, at length, Judas speaks out aloud his censure; not, however, "blustering and vehement" (as Teschendorff thinks), but,

[1] So in Pape's poem, Christus. S. 118. Horch's mystical and prophetical Bible speaks, however, in another style: "The broken vase with the precious unguent represented the breaking of His body, after which His name was to be as ointment poured forth, through the preaching of the Gospel, etc., according to Cant. i. 3. Might not the Lord's words, Matt. xxvi. 13, have such a thought in the background?"

rather, in the most measured style. The act was an ἀπώλεια, a useless, yea, sinful waste![1] What a contrast with this Judas is the affectionate heart of Mary! What a contrast, generally, between woman's spirit and that of the men of Israel, His enemies! How could he who had no heart for the love of Jesus, apprehend that of Mary? *To him* it has been long insufferable that Jesus should be honoured by many in such immoderate ways; to him, "who would rather have money in his purse than the Saviour in his heart." And now so precious an ointment is spent upon the very feet of the Master! That Mary should go to such an expense, he might have put to the account of appearance and excess of display; he reckons it up quickly in his mind —Three hundred pence are wasted here—indeed more than that (according to St Mark).

But he is aware of one very specious *objection;* for the Lord had often enough exhorted them to take care of the poor, while He had never, on the other hand, desired for Himself *such* distinctions. The comment would admit of a very *rational* exposition and justification:—How inconsiderate is the act of this Mary—how many poor in Bethany and elsewhere might have been solaced with such a sum as this, whereas now Jesus and we all derive from it nothing but a transitory scent, etc. Εἰς τί—of what use to him or to any is this waste? It is worth so much, and yet too little for such a purpose—*why* was it not more profitably applied in the right direction? Had this "pious enthusiast" but thought better of it, sold the ointment, and given the money *to the poor!* We doubt whether Judas meant—to *us* poor Apostles; but St John's explanatory remark[2] seems to intimate his meaning to have been that she should have given it to that end into *his* keeping, to be put into the common chest;

[1] Bengel hesitates not to cry out—Imo tu, Juda, *perditionis* es.

[2] Which well agrees with the notice of St Luke viii. 3; and shows besides that out of the poor bag of Jesus alms were sometimes given to the poor. That ἐβάσταζε signifies *auferre* or defrauding (Nonnus: ἀναερτάζειν, Theophyl.: κλέπτειν) we do not believe, in common with many others, Braune, for example; for the phrase does not admit such a meaning, and such a meaning does not suit the τὰ βαλλόμενα. We have no sympathy with the style of treating Scripture which allows Neander to think that this was a human error of the Evangelist, who was misled to discern ex eventu earlier signs of Judas' covetousness in this transaction.

that so he might by degrees expend it in alms and defray their common charges. The γλωσσόκομον was then probably empty, since Jesus was far removed from Galilee; but after all this hypocritical lamentation over the money stands in close connection with the traitorous and thievish lust which afterwards moved him.[1]

We shall not spend time upon the question, how St John came to know that Judas was a thief:—that may have made itself plain in some way afterwards; or let every one explain it as he may. But we shall enter carefully, in order to understand and apply the far-reaching word of Jesus in all its significance, into the general scope of the blame which was expressed, as it bore a typical character. And that, not simply because the original principle in Judas was so evil, and its semblance of good such rank hypocrisy, but because the other disciples could with no guilty intention so easily concur in it. We have here an example of all those views and of all those judgments which have their foundation in the favourite *principle of utilitarianism*, and which may too often be applied falsely,—to the wounding of pious hearts, and to the damage of that justifiable *cultus* in the Church of God which aims worthily to express the sentiments of reverence and love, or which in itself is productive of highest blessing. This lays bare the root of many evils in our own day, from the parsimonious dealing of statesmen and boards for ecclesiastical objects, and the suspicion with which missionary offerings for the extension of the kingdom of Christ are looked at "because of the poor whom we have at home," down to the slightest exhibitions of this feeling, calculating by the pettiest and most inapplicable rules. We have here, further and more generally, an example of all "cold judgments passed upon the virtuous emotions of warm hearts"[2]—of all more or less con-

[1] "Benevolence covered theft; the mask of good works inward hypocrisy. This is the consummate picture of hypocritical display in conjunction with dead works." (Harless.)

[2] See Schlosser's Essay with this title in Pfenninger's Sammlungen zu einem christol. Magazin, 2 Band, 2 Heft, S. 63, and which exhibits the "displeasure" of the disciples as not entering into the spirit and sentiment of Mary's heart!—But we very much doubt whether, according to Rothe (Ethik iii. 823), our Lord here in a general sense vindicates a lawful *luxury;* or whether, according to Schleiermacher (Homil. über Johan.), He here

scious or unconscious censures of the artless outgoings and acts of honest feeling—of all narrow-hearted criticism of others according to our own mind and temper—and, finally, of that slavish spirit which would mete out all good works in the service of God and our neighbour by rigid rule, and against which we should cry with all our hearts, "Pardon us, Lord, our *methodical* goodness and our *methodical* devotion!" Against all these, and everything like them, the words of our Lord Jesus most decisively protest; words in which He condemns those who condemned, consoles and dignifies His servant Mary, reveals even the prophetic spirit as suggesting to her this action, places everything in its own propriety, and thus, finally, resolves the discord which had arisen in their thoughts into the most lovely and noble harmony—for all except Judas.

There are, properly speaking, *four* words, the *succession* of which St Matthew, as always in our view, most accurately preserves, St Mark agreeing with him. The justification of the wounded Mary naturally comes first. With this is connected the acknowledgment of what was right in their care for the poor, for the sake of giving the other disciples their due; yet even in this there is a transition from these poor, always with them, to *Himself* who was about to leave them. *Then* follows the explanation—She hath anointed Me to the burial! Finally, and this could have been nowhere but at the close, the promise of a memorial throughout the world. St John, following his design, or according to his own sentiment and remembrance, places the ἐνταφιασμός first, as the true καλὸν ἔργον; he omits (in fulfilling it himself) the final promise, in order that he may *close* with the sorrowful words, which prepare the way for the Lord's departure—Me ye have not always!

St Matthew and St Mark *hint* that Judas commenced this crimination; and St John further hints that the other disciples concurred with him, though without malicious intention: the sing. ἄφες in our Evangelist is directed to Judas, the ἔχετε to

admits the propriety of gratifying the pure tendencies of our humanity by applying our earthly goods to the amenities of social life. Mary's view was something quite different from this; her beautiful act was not a tribute to social feeling, but an act performed on Jesus in worship, from holy and profound emotion.

all the rest. Thus the first word was one which stilled their murmur, reflecting back their blame upon themselves,—ἄφες or ἄφετε (the latter according to St Mark, as in the Vulg. *Sinite* though not in all the Codd.); and it simply said—Cease these thoughts and these words, they please *Me* not! In this single expression He utters His calm and dignified decision, admitting no appeal; but, as He is speaking in the circle of His disciples and friends, He proceeds to give the reason of His judgment. Instead of this St Matthew and St Mark have an additional and yet stronger protest against them. Why trouble ye, distress, and afflict—κόπους παρέχετε τῇ γυναικί or αὐτῇ? He does not say —*Me*, although He might, humanly speaking, have felt Himself aggrieved by their estimate, that such honour and anointing was too great, too precious for Him! But He is wounded in the wounding of Mary, troubled in her trouble; and this He utters therefore all the more emphatically, making her cause His own.[1] Thus this calm joy of love is embittered to Him; for in this perverse generation some drop of suffering must be infused into all His consolations. (Pfenninger: "Joyful as was this Sabbath meal, it ended not without trouble and disquietude.") How profoundly and affectionately does He sympathise with what Mary must have felt, who finds herself so unexpectedly misunderstood! "The delusion, that all must love what we love (and *as* we love) is so natural"—but now she is undeceived by a cold word of the Apostles, spoken in the midst of the warm impulse of her love. Albertini preaches incorrectly—"There dwelt in her secret heart a blessedness which could not be affected by any external circumstances; and she expected nothing other than the blame of the disciples. Nevertheless, when this was expressed so warmly, a slight cloud may have shaded the heaven of her soul." Oh no! How could she have *expected* blame from the *disciples?* and when this was expressed not *warmly*, indeed, but with the semblance of truth and reason, this κόπους παρέχετε was more than a passing cloud. She may have thought, "the disciples are right, I have acted inconsiderately, it will not please Him." On that account it is that the Lord surpasses their blame by His own instant praise and consolation;—not merely

[1] Yet, again, without mentioning Mary, or giving her any endearing name! That would have been derogatory to His dignity.

has she done nothing wrong, but a beautiful and noble deed. This καλόν is more, indeed, than ἀγαθόν; and the translation should hit the precise force of this expression. Affectionate devotion at the right time, the thoughtful, corresponsive expression of the deepest feeling—is not that lovely? Not merely does Mary perform a *work* in this anointing, as much as her sister's in her serving;[1] but her work is the more noble, if we understand and estimate it in its spirit and meaning. Behold here the moral *æsthetics*, as it were, in the estimation of human acts, which the Lord teaches and requires. Elsewhere He commends faith or love; here, because it is assailed, He commends the *deed;* but derives its profound value from the state of the soul, which is expressed by external act. He corrects, by His lofty decision, the manifold errors of human judgment as to what is good, and what is noble, in human works. It is not necessary that they be great, and widely influential acts, for the result gives them not their value, but the intention; still less are we to apply everywhere the standard of common benevolence or usefulness, for an apparent waste may be deserving of commendation. Finally, He does not omit to add, as the deepest ground of His supreme verdict—She hath done it *unto Me!* (Matt. εἰς ἐμέ, Mark ἐν ἐμοί.) Not so much to complain—Is that then of no importance? Am I not worthy of this honour? as to teach generally by this specific instance *what* is the first, and most essential regulating measure of all good and lovely works. "The *first* command is, To love God above all; and *then*, our neighbour as ourselves."[2] Of what value is all our vaunted love of our neighbour and of the poor, without the love of God therein?[3] But He places Himself involuntarily and naturally in the stead of God, even in the midst of His self-renouncing, sympathising humility: for He could do no otherwise. Humbly self-renouncing, as a Friend in the

[1] The εἰργάσατο with ἔργον is more emphatic than a mere ἐποίησεν.

[2] So Lössel on the passage, in his Wort und Leben, Betrachtungen nach dem Ev. Matth. S. 503.

[3] "Not, as men are wont to say, for *God's* sake!" So Diesterweg. Harless, on the other hand: "Judas, the hypocrite and traitor, was the first preacher of that doctrine of the exclusive value of so-called good works, in the New Testament."

circle of friends, He began; majestically, judicially self-asserting must He continue and end. Both are suddenly combined in one brief sentence—and this is the authentic style of the words of Jesus! Done unto *Him*, not done unto *Him*—this will finally arbitrate upon all the works of men. Be confident, therefore, misunderstood soul: He knoweth thee and thy purpose. And even if His disciples blame thee, He will justify thee both now and hereafter.

The poor, of whom ye other disciples speak with good intention and partial truth (all three have the article)—are never wanting to you. It is probable that the Lord, recalling a passage of Scripture, said *only* this, and that the addition of St Mark is an explanatory reflection; yet this deduction seems very appropriate in the connection. *Ὅταν θέλητε* would then contain, at the same time, a gentle ironical intimation of the absence of earnest intention on the part of Judas; while the *αὐτοὺς εὖ ποιῆσαι* would be the corresponding counterpart to the *καλὸν ἔργον ἐν ἐμοί*. The passage alluded to is Deut. xv. 11, which must be taken with ver. 4 of the same chapter. In connection with the remission of debts in the year of jubilee it was said, אֶפֶס כִּי לֹא יִהְיֶה בְּךָ אֶבְיוֹן—where the אֶפֶס כִּי may be understood variously.[1] Not, *to the end* that no poor may be among you. Rather, with Michaelis: *unless* there be no poor needing remission—yet he is opposed, as Meyer well remarks, by ver. 11 afterwards. Since elsewhere (*e.g.* Num. xiii. 28; Amos ix. 8; Judg. iv. 9, see Nold. Conc. part. who adds our passage with hesitation) אֶפֶס כִּי is *tamen*, *veruntamen*, a promise has been found here as a ground of encouragement for the remission:—Ye shall do yourselves no injury thereby, in making yourselves poor; for the Lord will bless you in your obedience to His commandments. But this is forced, and the אֶבְיוֹן is still the same, in whose favour the remission is to be made. Consequently, the only right meaning is (that to which Aben-Ezra's expression, misunderstood by Rosenmüller, pointed)—*Nevertheless* or *in truth* there would be no poor among you, if ye obeyed My com-

[1] But not, with Luther, that it is not a conjunction at all. He makes an inappropriate distinction between the "beggar," ver. 4, and the "poor," ver. 11, and thus makes a Bible-sentence very often used by the uninformed.

mandments, etc.[1] With this is placed in significant contrast the subsequent prediction of ver. 11, לֹא יֶחְדַּל אֶבְיוֹן מִקֶּרֶב הָאָרֶץ—the poor will not be wanting, they will not cease; instead of which the Lord says, πάντοτε ἔχετε μεθ' ἑαυτῶν, in order to prepare for the antithesis—but *Me* ye have not always. Thus, that there always are poor rests, according to the whole internal connection of that chapter of Moses, which is at once the solution of the fact and true in history, upon the *sin* of Israel, which yet by full obedience might be capable of blessing. The Lord now confirms the same in His word *to the disciples* (which like every such word is designed also for the future of *His* people) with regard to the Christian commonwealth. Diesterweg in his book "Der Lebensfrage der Civilisation," maintains boldly that "it was not the eternal Creator who established or produced the present system of social life," and he is so far right as our sin is certainly the original cause, as of every evil, so also of our pauperism. But when he altogether denies the Divine dispensation of poverty as the punishment of unrighteousness, and lays all its blame upon the not giving of those who have the means, he is entangled in that great error of a civilised age concerning this question of life which has only made the matter worse with *its* help. In effect, no reiterated *lex* agraria can abolish the poverty which is ever being reproduced, no St Simon or Bettina can stop this fountain; we must, indeed, *give* with the wisdom of charity, but without hoping that that will make poverty cease. The Lord's πάντοτε approves its truth to our own day, on account of sin, indeed, but also as a consequent counsel and will of God; Christian people must humbly adapt their views to this fact, and thoughtfully consider that the giving of alms is not the only *benevolence* to the poor. And to this the εὖ ποιῆσαι of St Mark might point! Show to the poor by thy own shining example, how He is loved and honoured—this is here the one thing which is needful to needy man.

[1] See Baumgarten's Commentary, who compares for אֶבְיוֹן, Numb. xxii. 35, and beautifully deduces that Israel was to see in every poor man a testimony of the (already presupposed by the law) disobedience of the people; and consequently should *on that account* help his brother. Compare Jarchi, who simply unites vers. 4 and 11—If in one case ye do, and in the other, do not, God's will.

The Lord has thus admitted all that was right in the thoughts of the disciples who were misled by Judas; for the traitor and thief himself He has nothing more to say, although He looks through his soul at this moment of murmuring hypocrisy. He does not rebuke them in common—Ye have spoken a false and evil word concerning her noble act; for that would be too hard for those who were led astray with a good intention. He does not detect and expose the wicked spirit of their misleader—for "He is not just now disposed to inflict severe condemnation."[1] *Sorrowfully*—as He thinks of those fittest Scripture words which speak of the sad continuance of the poor, with all its profound meaning for all times—sorrowfully He leads them back to His own person, for which this was thought to be too much honour: But Me ye have *not always!* In a manner almost marvellous, He places Himself, to whom all actions of thanksgiving and love are due, in parallel with the poor on whom we bestow benefactions, and by Him, in His human tenderness, the separation from the earthly fellowship of His own is keenly felt. All that He had already foretold concerning His departure is brought to their remembrance by the gentle but emphatic *οὐ πάντοτε*—as if He should say, Have ye then forgotten that I shall be but a little while longer with you? But in the symbolical meaning of the whole, since *we* also may anoint Him like Mary, and thereby do better than by all our "confederations for elevating the working classes" without Him,—we may properly reflect in what sense we also have Him *not always* so near in His spiritual presence, and therefore that the right opportunities of presenting our offerings of thanks and love to Him are to be jealously seized. If the Lord spoke, in the former clause, for distant futurity, He may probably also have thought, in the latter, of that which we have now expressed.

We remarked above that the words which St John has placed first are to be regarded as spoken now:—She has, in truth, paid Me the "*last honour*," for death and the sepulchre are immediately before Me. At the moment of His kingly anointing, He speaks of dying; for thoughts of death now continually fill His soul, and images of physical death float before His eyes.

[1] Albertini in the sermon before quoted.

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

In the midst of this festal joy He sees His anointed body as an embalmed corpse in the sepulchre! Into what a depth in the human consciousness of Jesus does this inexpressibly touching utterance—which suppressed all discord in every heart but that of Judas—permit us to look! The ἐνταφιάσαι or ἐνταφιασμός is found in all the narratives—it includes the whole interment, to which the anointing also belongs. St Matthew expresses the essential ground-thought in the simplest and most intelligible form,—In that she hath poured it on My *body*, she did it for My burial. St Mark introduces a more specific feature in the προέλαβε—She hath come beforehand, or hath anticipated it; and the meaning of this, as reconciling all the accounts, can only be that she performed on the living body that which was not performed on the dead, being both needless and unpermitted. St John, although he reverses the order, appears to us here also to preserve the original expression used by our Lord in τετήρηκεν.[1] This word is obviously opposed to the ἐπράθη and ἐδόθη in which Judas' desire had been expressed:—She has done rightly not to sell the ointment (which she possessed), but to preserve it for use *on this day*. Whence and for what purpose Mary obtained this μύρον (whether for the interment of Lazarus and his delayed embalming, as mentioned above) is a question not alluded to here, and all suppositions are free; but we, for our own part, think a provision made for the embalming of her brother, whether before or after his death, altogether improbable. The other anointings of the evangelical history give us instances of ointment being kept for sundry purposes. The Lord goes not beyond the fact of her having it in possession, as the disciples thought desirable another application. And we may say, in some sense, with Rieger, "she must have reserved it under the guidance of a higher hand," for the Lord *establishes from the providential significance of her action its*

[1] Lachmann's reading ἵνα τηρήσῃ, approved by Luthardt (Vulg. ut servet, Nonn. ὄφρα φυλάξῃ), Lücke properly regards, notwithstanding its diplomatic pretension, as incorrect; for the Lord takes the present day proleptically as the ἡμέρα τοῦ ἐνταφιασμοῦ (and according to St Mark's προέλαβεν). Alford, similarly: The rec. reading seems to be an adaptation to Mark xiv. 8, in order to escape from the difficulty of understanding how she *could keep for His burial* what she *poured out now*.

moral propriety also, the genuine acceptableness before God of the sentiment and its expression.

Mary, however, thinks of nothing more than paying the Lord a tribute of honour at this feast, she does not refer in her own thoughts to His entombment or embalming. Many are not contented with this, but ascribe to her, according to the letter of the Lord's words, which certainly point that way, an actual consciousness of the near approaching burial of Jesus. (So Stückelberger, *e.g.*, among preachers: but the view has always been attractive to many. Dräseke says, "as she could not avert His fate, she would at least consecrate Him to His sad destiny.") This would be an impressive contrast with the deep blindness of Judas upon the future of Jesus,[1] as exhibiting the keen insight of a loving soul, or, at least, the half-conscious presentiment which overcame her on such a day and at such a critical moment (as He sat, that is, by the side of Lazarus, for whom the anointing should have been; and is purposing to go to Jerusalem among His enemies):—"Alas, when Thou diest, none will anoint Thee; I will therefore do it beforehand." There is something so attractive in this, that we dare not unconditionally deny it; but to our mature consideration there appears in it also something which is out of harmony with the plain simplicity of the whole procedure. We, therefore, hold to the common view, which every one can understand, that the Lord simply ascribes His own thoughts to Mary, and now by a *prophetic word* elevates, interprets, and glorifies her καλὸν ἔργον of affectionate love into a *prophetic act*. And here we are at one with Luthardt: "Her action becomes, without her knowledge, a symbolical token of what was to befall Jesus." This corresponds with the unconscious significance of many other actions and words during these His last days. Mary like Caiaphas!) This was the most ancient notion, as witnessed in the Peshito, which adds in Matthew and Mark a אֵיךְ:—*as if* or *as it were* for My burial. And it would have to the disciples the impressive meaning,—Would ye blame her, *if*—I were laid in the sepulchre dead? Would this anointing be too costly if it were actually for My

[1] For by means of the greatest sinner among the disciples, him who least understood the counsel of God, must the fulfilment of that counsel be brought about.

ἐνταφιασμὸς? Now, then, I tell you (do ye yet not know it of yourselves?)—it is near enough, and her deed has the value, before God and before Me, of an anointing for My burial![1] (See in Grotius the striking amplification of this thought.)

St Mark, finally, gives us another beautiful and undoubtedly genuine word, though he places it before us transitional,—*She hath done what she could!* The ἔσχεν of this phrase certainly cannot admit of any petty application to her wealth; we cannot tolerate such an interpretation of the Lord's sentiment as, in Judas' reckoning spirit, would make Him say—In the case of one more needy than she, such an objection would be ungraciously applied, but she, over and above, *hath* the means! Oh no, even if she, like the poor widow at the Treasury, had applied her utmost all to this purpose, Jesus would have likewise dignified and commended her act. Nor must we translate with Bengel's translation (though not in the Gnomon): What she *had to do* she has done,—what was appointed to her and therefore obligatory. This is opposed to the grammatical meaning; but to take ἔχειν for having in one's power or being able, is sound and safe. Thus, as it has been almost always practically understood in the church, it is the most gracious and the highest praise which any one can receive from the Lord's supreme estimate of his acts—What she could do, she has actually done! Mary was made capable of this noble act by her strong internal love—therefore she restrained not its expression, kept back nothing. Humble thyself, reader and hearer, in the presence of this Word, and think how great a thing it is, and how seldom it happens, that the Lord can say *this* of any man! But understand, also, *from this*, wherefore He has ordained a memorial of this deed for all futurity.

She hath done what she could! She has, even down to our Lord's sepulchre, performed on Him the beautiful offices of thankful love! This shall be the *inscription* over her, her *memorial* in all the world,[2] inseparably bound up with that Gospel which tells of the death by which life comes to the world. The

[1] Augustin de Civit. I. 13 justifies, by Mary's commendation, the expressions of love and honour paid, generally, to the corporibus defunctorum: Nec ideo tamen contemnenda et abjicienda sunt, etc.

[2] Μνημόσυνον in the Sept. for זִכָּרוֹן and זֵכֶר, also in Esth. ix. 32 for בְּסֵפֶר.

more unexpected and unusual is this utterance of our Lord, the more unhesitatingly we receive it from the hands of the two first Evangelists. It is (as Niemeyer says in his Characteristik) "the *only* time that the Lord has mentioned its reputation as the reward of a noble work." We must not shrink from admitting this because all glory belongs to God alone; in the words of Jesus "such remembrance is recorded as a good thing which, in a certain case, appertains to recompense" (Palmer, Katechetik. S. 164). But we must more deeply consider, that just now, when the question was of the oblique censures of men, and the vain show of supposed good works was in contrast, Jesus confers such honour upon a deed of love which even the disciples misunderstood and the world would think nothing of. "While He well knew that even in Christendom such perverted views of merit and fame would arise, He took this occasion to prescribe what should be true fame and true worthiness, and to assign to those who deserve it an abiding remembrance—in order that here, *at this last cross-way on the way to His cross*, all His followers should discriminate and decide." (Lossel.) Although the act had the appearance, and it was so interpreted against Mary, as if she designed by this costly anointing to make herself prominent, yet Mary in reality thought of nothing so little as her *own* honour; it was under the irrepressible impulse of her emotion that her silent, diffident spirit overcame itself and thus come forward. She sought no more, as Hase beautifully says, than a gracious glance. Nevertheless, and on that very account, the Lord predicts and appoints that she should be praised from generation to generation upon earth. Who but Himself had the power to insure to any work of man, even if resounding throughout the whole earth in his own time, an imperishable remembrance in the stream of history? Behold, once more, here the majesty of His royal, judicial supremacy in the government of the world, expressed in this *Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν*!

Yet He does not say at once and without qualification *εἰς ἔπαινον* or *εἰς δόξαν αὐτῆς*;[1] but that which should be spoken as

[1] Although the good Sepp, with great simplicity, makes the Lord glance at the future of His Church and the *veneration of relics!* But *εἰς μνημόσυνον αὐτῶν λαλη θήσεται ὃ ἐποίησαν*—at this limit the "veneration" should restrain itself.

a memorial of her, He applies to our instruction as an example. Similarly, Mary's deed obtains this undying remembrance only through its connection with Him and His Gospel. By ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ κόσμῳ (Mark, εἰς ὅλον τὸν κόσμον) He already here testifies what He afterwards prophesies to His disciples, Matt. xxiv. 14. *This* Gospel: that is, the message of peace and blessedness which should spring forth from His *death*, the kernel and centre of which should be His dying. This *Gospel* is not so much doctrine as *history;* this history is great and significant in all its lesser circumstances, the selection of which, under God's disposal, should be the κήρυγμα:—all this lies in the simple word which was spoken to this intent. Vainly does Br. Bauer's frenzy rage against the Lord's counsel—"Alas, that one must speak of such things! would that they had fallen into the oblivion which is their meet lot!" In vain he imagines that he "shall say such keen and annihilating things as shall render needless any further mention of them." Many other mockers' and blasphemers' names have been blotted out and their memory forgotten—but that which Mary did in secret Bethany has been spoken of till now; and will be spoken of to the end of time, because the Lord has so decreed by one of those words not one of which shall fall to the ground. Therefore the fourth Evangelist gives us her *name;*[1] therefore St Matthew and St Mark place the history at the commencement of the Passion, that it may for ever excite, in connection with the sufferings of Christ, the feeling thought, All this He did and suffered for me—what do I for Him? Have I done what I could? Thus was it foreseen and provided: and Mary not only predicted the death and burial of Jesus, but preaches now throughout the world in this Gospel:—His alone be the love of all, let all be done to His honour and in His service, even all charities to the poor.

[1] Here in the repeated narrative, and in ch. xi. 2, presuming an acquaintance with the narrative.

LAST PUBLIC DECLARATION CONCERNING HIS COMING DEATH. THE CORN OF WHEAT, AND HIS DISCIPLESHIP; THE PRAYER OF ANGUISH; THE GLORIFICATION; THE BRIEF CONTINUANCE OF THE LIGHT.

(Ch. xii. 23–36.)

All this we embrace under one head; for it is manifest that through all the fulness of these utterances of our Lord, the continuous fundamental thought of His *impending death* may be distinctly traced. As at Bethany in the circle of His friends,—Me ye have not always; so now in the temple aloud before friend and foe,—Yet only a little while is the light with you! And this is the reply to the people's question, how the being taken away from the earth could suit the *Messiah* or the *Son of man;* it comes conclusively after profound sayings concerning the necessity of His death in order to His fruit and glorification, after a public exhibition of the commencing anguish of His conflict, in which the Father promises from heaven and confirms to Him the victory. Thus the correct superscription of the whole is—The Lord's *last public* declaration concerning His death.[1]

St John has recorded after the anointing the Entry into Jerusalem, like the Synoptics; but he has further mentioned the connection between the people's jubilation and the resurrection of Lazarus. The disposition of the Pharisees, as opposed to the people, is here in ver. 19 the same which Lu. xix. 39 reports,—but it is described as more bitter, its internal vexation being more fully exhibited. As already in ch. iii. 26, the disciples of the Baptist hyperbolically complained that all men came to Him; as in Mark i. 37 the disciples announced, all men seek for Thee; so now, but with more appearance of absolute truth, they say that, in spite of all their precautions, *The world is gone after*

[1] More correctly than Lampe's Valedictoria gloriæ Christi in templo manifestatio—although he is so far right as concerns the glory of Christ. It is the last public *discourse* generally (de Wette), only in the Gospel of St John.

Him![1] In these words, too, there is an enforced *prediction.* For although the speakers used the expression only according to the current meaning of עוֹלָם and עַלְמָא (everybody, all men)—yet would all the people of the world be drawn to Him, after the vanquishing of the world's Prince by His death. It is most significant that immediately afterwards a pledge and earnest of this is afforded in the desire of *certain Greeks* to see Him.

As the Lord on Monday at the cleansing of the temple testified that this house of God should be called a house of prayer *for all nations* (Mark xi. 17), so even now already on the Sunday, the day of His entry, this had received a fulfilment in the coming of these Gentiles, according to the original decree of 1 Kings viii. 41. We have in our table placed this incident of the Greeks,[2] and what followed it, on the *first day.* Many, indeed, think that it should be placed, if not at the close, yet several days later than the cleansing of the temple, since according to the Synoptics Jesus spoke several times afterwards publicly to the people, whereas here after ver. 36 He departs and hides Himself. But this hiding, the like of which occurs before in St John, must not be regarded as final and definitive; it does not exclude a return to vindicate the temple, and a daily teaching afterwards. Indeed, it thus maintains its *historiographical* truth according to St John's plan, which presupposes and passes by everything else in order to exhibit this scene of the first day as the closing scene, and this discourse as the *last* public declaration in *his* Gospel. For ver. 20, in its close connection with ver. 19, seems still actually to belong to ver. 12.

[1] Properly, follows Him, adheres to Him, forsaking us! Mark the lamenting ἀπῆλθεν, here different from Mar. i. 20. *Ye see it* that Caiaphas is right; we must not let Him thus alone, all men believe in Him! Ye see that *ye do nothing* with your sparing half-measures! Θεωρεῖτε is not, as Erasmus thought, a question. Nor do we prefer with Bengel (on account of πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς, the ὠφελεῖτε being copied from the θεωρεῖτε) the reading ὠφελοῦμεν (retained in Vulg. and Nonnus, but not in the Syr.). The vigorous party speak to the timid—Follow only the counsel of our prudent high priest! Lange is altogether wrong in thinking it the helpless wrath of impotent opponents, mocking one another.

[2] Whose announcement to the Lord Lange reckons as the culmination of our Lord's influence upon the people on the Monday; while Neander assigns it to the day of entry which excited so much public attention.

More important than the definition of the time, which we simply give according to our own unprejudiced view, is the certainty that the Ἕλληνες were not Jews (proselytes), not even proselytes of righteousness, but at most proselytes of the gate, and certainly no other than *heathens:* see our observations on ch. vii. 35, and the connection of this event with what follows. The Vulg. translates *Gentiles*, and, according to St John's phrase in ch. xix. 20, they were probably *Greeks* proper.[1] They were ἐκ τῶν ἀναβαινόντων, which Glass., Grot., Beng., etc., understand—who were accustomed to come up yearly or oftener;[2] such σεβόμενοι Ἕλληνες as are alluded to in the Acts of the Apostles. They came up not, strictly speaking, to keep the feast, but merely ἵνα προσκυνήσωσι. It was not, however, the presence of these Gentile guests at the festival which was remarkable and typical—that was a frequent occurrence; but that these heathens should ask just at this time for the Lord, should *desire to see Jesus*. The reason for which they turn to Philip seems to be intimated in the otherwise useless addition, that he was of Bethsaida in *Galilee* (according to the older and wider meaning of this name); either he was known to them as on the borders of their land (against which Bengel objects the κύριε, but too critically), or they observed that he understood Greek, or what else may be suggested.[3] Philip, at first, probably, regards their desire as an unreasonable curiosity; he then counts it remarkable, does not venture to repel them, yet still less to bring the matter forward alone:—for would the Messiah, just now proclaimed, and triumphantly entering, receive Gentiles at once into His presence?[4] He therefore confers with his countryman Andrew (ch. i. 44).

We would see Jesus! Words these of deeper than their apparent meaning, and in this typical history of such significance that they have been regarded by a profounder exposition with perfect propriety as an expression of the desire of the whole heathen

[1] Sepp sees in them Armenians, the deputation of King Abgarus!

[2] Lampe: qui non casu aliquo sed fixo more festa Israelis frequentabant.

[3] Nonnus contents himself with an ἀγχιμόλῳ Φιλίππῳ, that is, who met them accidentally.

[4] It may be supposed that the Lord was in the interior of the temple, in the court of the women (ch. viii. 20), into which no Gentiles dared to intrude. We do not agree with Luthardt as to the improbability of this.

world, and used as a great Missionary text. The simple ἰδεῖν means more in those who now utter it than the ἰδεῖν τίς ἐστι of Zacchæus; it is a modest expression, which Beza rightly interprets—ut privatim convenirent Jesum. The glory so strangely mingled with lowliness at the great entry, the fame of His deeds generally, and of His raising the dead, the hostile influences which they saw at work against Him,—all these combined to stimulate their attention, and to awaken within them a concealed longing after that which they felt wanting, and might find in Him. Thus do they, in the name of their nation, and of all nations, coincide in the desire of the true Israel during all ages from the Father's time (Lu. x. 24), to see what here is to be seen; thus unconsciously do they speak, for the Evangelists' and our right understanding, in the name of the world of heathenism, the highest θέλειν of which in all times has this for its goal—to find and to know *a Jesus*. These men from the West represent at the end of Christ's life that which the wise men from the East represented at its beginning; but those come to the Cross of the King, even as these came to His manger, and receive presently more full intelligence. That which the Lord takes this opportunity to utter is also a *concluding discourse*, even as are the subsequent ones in the former Evangelists; and it was not simply (as B.-Crusius thinks) "according to the design of this fourth Gospel to give the final utterance of Jesus over Judaism," but these words were actually spoken in the spirit of that fundamental idea which runs through the synoptical discourses also—Israel's rejection, and the passing of the kingdom to the Gentiles. Yet Herder, likewise, says not without truth, "Happy John! It was for thee to change the denunciatory symbols of the other Evangelists exhibiting the rejection of the Jewish people, their terrific woes against the Pharisees, into a joyful outlook over all *those* nations whose language thou didst employ! (ch. xii. 37–50). For time had confirmed this wide prospect of Christ."

Ver. 23. Did then the Lord refuse the admission of the Greeks, as Lampe and Kleuker in particular,[1] Meyer, Braune,

[1] "He denied their request, and said: What more would these Greeks see in Me? The time is come for Me to die; and that will be followed by a glorification which strangers and foreigners shall come to know, *without the*

and others, suppose?[1] Can this be discerned in His *answer?* We think not, but should be more disposed to interpret it thus: They have come at the right *hour* of My glorification before all the world, they are justified in their desire, in a sense much deeper than they suppose.[2] But even this seems a superficial view of the connection, and a more profound sense must be sought in the fundamental idea of the *glorification of the Son of man* which now fills the soul of our Lord, for the more complete exposition of which, however, we must refer to His second utterance, chap. xiii. 31, 32. The αὐτοῖς after ἀπεκρίνατο appears (as Alford maintains) literally to point to Philip and Andrew alone (in the presence of the other disciples); but we must not forget to take into account the compression and comprehensiveness of St John's historical style at this crisis, the abruptness with which he elevates the hidden meaning and passes by the detail, while preserving of course absolute truth in every incident that he records. It is assumed by many that *after* the Lord had received the Greeks and spoken something to them, He addressed the disciples at more length, as here recorded; but this is contradicted by the strict connection between the ἀπεκρίνατο and the λέγουσι of ver. 22. And are we to suppose St John to have *omitted* what Jesus spake to the Greeks, just at the time when he is making their desire so significantly prominent? We cannot, with our views, avoid referring the αὐτοῖς to the Apostles and the Greeks together. This is an allowable and intelligible conciseness; for the granting of their request is left to be inferred by the attentive reader from the whole scope of our Lord's words. Either the Lord spoke in Greek (as, doubtless, elsewhere often), or the Greeks understood, which may without

necessity of any personal knowledge of Me. For this they could not as yet behold in Me." In his treatise, Johannes, Petrus, und Paulus als Christologen, S. 121.

[1] Laufs (in Stud. u. Krit. 1853, 2, 379) also maintains that Jesus throughout held fast His mission to Israel alone. Schleiermacher, on the other hand, thinks it may be assumed, despite appearances in the narrative, that Jesus did not leave this laudable desire of the Greeks unsatisfied.

[2] Dräseke expounds: "They *should* see Me, they *will* see Me, and *soon* shall they see Me. For the time when the world shall know Me, and shall behold the glory of God manifested in Me, and through Me in mankind, is already come!"

scruple be supposed, the popular tongue of Judea. Suffice it that we cannot otherwise understand the Evangelist than that he presupposes the Greeks to be hearing the discourse of Jesus with the rest, and, indeed, that the first portion of it was specially spoken for them. Meyer's note correctly finds here "an instruction designed for the sensuous eye of the Greeks." These guests at the feast were to see the Cross succeeding the triumphant entry—and He presents to their reflections beforehand the solution of the mystery, and a relief to its offence, in His words concerning the grain of wheat. Thus, in a way in which no φιλόσοφος had ever spoken, "He explains to them in brief His *system*."[1] The disciples with the Greeks, and the Greeks with the disciples, expect after the Hosanna still greater things, His universal glorification; and the Lord tells them,—Yea, verily, the hour is come, but My *glorification* will proceed differently from your thoughts of it. As King, rather as the Saviour of all people, shall I soon be glorified: and deeper still,—as the *Son of man*, the normal and central Man, the second Adam. But only by My *dying* will the Divine energy of My humanity be set free and exerted for all mankind.

Ver. 24. For this He does not appeal to the testimony of the prophets (evidence, too, that He is speaking to the Greeks also), but to a secretly prophesying similitude of nature which His words immediately elevate and explain;—of that *nature*, the manifestations of which "the sensuous eye of the Greeks" had profoundly observed without profoundly understanding. For that He signifies Himself by the grain of wheat, is evident from the connection with the former clause, as also from the *Ἀμὴν ἀμήν*. Yea, not only prophecy in Israel, not only the presentiments and dreams of the heathen world, in which the dim traces of a primeval prophecy are to be discerned, but Nature herself also speaks of the mystery of a redeeming death. That from death generally, which is the wages of sin, and, as properly *death*, came first into the *world* by sin, new life is brought forth —is *now* a phenomenon and symbol everywhere witnessed. But indeed, the caterpillar which becomes a moth, and everything

[1] Lange agrees with this, and regards these words of Jesus as the expression of His first historical introduction and greeting to the Hellenic national spirit—the Gospel for the Greeks.

else of the same kind in the animal world, must be regarded as on that account appertaining to the after creation of insects and worms, which was heralded by the change of the serpent-form, and was then the produce of death and corruption.[1] Nevertheless, since the Fall was foreseen, and the redeeming death of the Son of God and son of man already lay in the deep counsels of eternity, the Creator implanted types of it in His pure earthly creation before the Fall. Thus we have here in the Divine ordinance of the *fruit* springing from the *seed*, of the new growth springing from the death of the old, the most primitive prophecy of the mystery of atonement and sacrifice which the pure creation contains. And St John now discloses the inmost kernel of the synoptical seed and harvest parables, and of that first discourse of our Lord concerning sowing and reaping which he himself recorded in ch. iv. 35–38. As firmly established as the covenant of God touching seedtime and harvest, is His counsel touching the death of Christ and the life of the world. As in the *present* process of digestion the food perishes in the stomach to reappear in vivified flesh and blood, so in a symbolical analogy the seed-corn *dies* in order to bring forth fruit. "This holds good generally of all seed (σίτου ἤ τινος τῶν λοιπῶν, 1 Cor. xv. 37), but the Lord, not without meaning, specifies grain, the noblest, that of Palestine, *wheat*:—partly, because it is the most important in man's yearly sowing and reaping, and partly, because in fact (as Wesley remarks) the corn of wheat does according to the laws of nature more effectually dissolve and perish in pushing forth the all but invisible germ, than other

[1] The butterfly is not an image of the rejuvenescence of life—"such as may take place in unfallen planets, and might have taken place upon the earth if Adam had not fallen—that form of change by which the paradisaical man might have made the transition from his first into his second life" (Lange). For what purpose would then serve the pupa state, and the chrysalis? We cannot imagine the caterpillars in Paradise. As it respects the "after creation of insects and worms," which my critic Münchmeyer excepts against, this is not my "subjective notion," nor is it an offence against Scripture, but a tradition of old hidden doctrine well known to the learned, as may be seen in V. Meyer's "Bibeldeutungen," S. 129. Bleek (Stud. u. Krit. 1831. 3. S. 498) admits the notion of the Zend Avesta as presupposed in the Pentateuch, which indeed only borders on the truth.

kinds of seed which serve it as a permanent covering or as sustenance under the earth.[1]

As in nature, so in the life of man, in the history of nations, of which the Greeks were directly reminded, it is a law of universal operation that out of a self-renouncing, self-sacrificing resignation of all, the benediction of a richer fruitfulness, of a glorified and multiplied existence, springs forth. When that which a man possesses, is—to use the words of Beck (Lehrwissenschaft i. 520)—"not appropriated and enjoyed according to the desire of the present moment, but foregone, as in the case of the seed which is sown, *in reliance upon the Divine law of the benediction of increase, which pervades the whole economy of things*"—there follows most assuredly in every case a rich harvest! We may well suppose these pondering Greeks to have cried—This is the truth, Thy wise saying does verily hold good, Thou wonderful Son of man in Israel! Yet the last and highest illustration of this truth in His own person, they could only, like the Apostles, understand when the great event had taken place. Had this first seed-corn died and fallen into the earth, it would have been *alone* in its own peculiar pre-eminence—just as Jesus stood in His power of the Spirit, His Divine-human life and energy, incommunicable, independent of and above the rest of the human race, before He died. But now what thousand times thousand fold fruit does He bear! From the time that He gave up His soul as an offering for sin, He sees His seed and prolongs His days (Isa. liii. 10). This is what was meant by the צֶמַח of the prophets Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Zechariah; and by Ezekiel's מַטָּע לְשֵׁם, ch. xxxiv. 29. And, further, in this word of our Lord lies the germ of St Paul's resurrection doctrine in 1 Cor. xv. They assuredly err, who too narrowly confine the application of the fruit-bearing seed-corn to the *body* of the Lord as expanded, after His glorification, in the Spirit-pervaded congregation of His people;

[1] Singularem id emphasin habere circa *frumenta* notant historiæ naturalis scriptores, quia in eo differunt a cæteris plantis, quod *omnium*(?) aliarum plantarum semina, ubi radices emiserunt, soleant reliquas quoque partes conservare et foras protudere, sed partes *seminis frumenti* sola radice separata, quæ ex terra protuberat, corrumpantur ac pereant. Thus we read in Lampe.

it is rather the whole heavenly Son of man as such who voluntarily sinks down *into this earth* of death and the curse, into the domain and destiny of sinful men, not to remain there, but to rise out of it as the glorified Glorifier, the risen Raiser of men. It is true, nevertheless, that as the whole Humanity is intended, so the death and resurrection of the *body* is included; yea, its glorification finds its consummation in corporeity, the fruit-bearing is mediated by that, the Spirit operates and continuously flows forth from that same flesh and blood which became dead, and in which before His death He abode alone, incommunicable and in mysterious exclusiveness apart.[1]

Vers. 25, 26. But now the Lord goes on at once to declare, and this is the immediate design of His present words, that there is no other law of life for His servants and followers; that there is no other way to preserve or redeem again ourselves, than by the self-hating and self-renouncing surrender of ourselves to death. That which holds good of Himself in its own peculiar, unapproachable sense, as of the seed which He alone could sow, the sacrifice which He alone could offer—is not the less on that account a type for us, and is fulfilled in us, even to similar victory and blessedness in His fellowship. This is a thought made familiar to us by many of our Lord's other discourses throughout the Evangelists. Even the first sentence here, in ver. 25, is almost literally the same which is spoken in the Synoptics, Matt. x. 38, 39; Lu. ix. 23, 24, xiv. 26, xvii. 33; so that we have not now to expound it for the first time, but may refer to our exposition of those passages. From this verse we may understand the twofold meaning of ψυχή, as also the true signification of φιλεῖν and μισεῖν, the latter being understood to be the true loving and preserving. Instead of the σώσει and ζωογονήσει of those parallel places, we have here φυλάξει, which defines more sharply the identity of the surrendered and regained life; further, we have here an addition which specifically corresponds with the connection, μισῶν—ἐν τῷ κοσμῷ τούτῳ. For, as Bengel says, *hic mundus* ad *amandam* vitam per se trahit

[1] I am perfectly of the same opinion with Luthardt, that here the necessity of the death of Christ "in order to His self-communication" is maintained. But I cannot admit, with him, that the concomitant reference to the curse and penalty of sin is excluded by this fundamental idea.

—consequently this is the strength of warfare and victory, to hate our own life in a world which for ever solicits to mere false self-love, and lives in nothing but the element of self-destruction. Compare the same addition in 1 John iv. 17. In this alone consists the true *following* of Christ, that which He requires of all who are willing to *serve* Him, to honour His supremacy, and pledge themselves to His rule. I will have, He says, no other "serving" than this following,—and in the second clause, that which contains His promise, He means by διάκονος and ἐὰν διακονῇ only *this* service in the genuine spirit of truth.

Where I am, there shall or there should also My servant be! It is needlessly disputed whether this is an added condition or a promise and reward, for in the church of all ages the Spirit has taught the double application of this word. For this is one of those ambiguous sayings which embrace in the very expression used the transitional idea of the thing expressed:—here as there, now as then, in the cross and death as in glory and life, in the conflict and in the victory, in abasement as in exaltation, the true servant of Jesus must be and will *be there, where He is.* The two senses pass into one another, the requirement itself becomes a promise, includes it as the sweet kernel within the bitter shell; this is so true, that, as all right experience attests, we, *as* followers, and bearers likewise of the cross of Christ, are conscious of having our conversation with Him already in heaven. But to weak faith, which can scarcely in the gloom of conflict grasp this truth, the words just as they stand have the force of a mightily convincing consolation:—Art thou not in His way of reproach, suffering, and death, in this present world, wilt thou not be found there with Him, where He is? What more wouldst thou have? Thou must tarry where He tarried, and attain to the same goal by the same way! Ὅπου εἰμὶ ἐγώ has not, as is commonly said, precisely the same force as in chs. xiv. 3, xvii. 24,—but this Future is here first regarded as growing out of the immediately following Present in the νῦν of ver. 27. When the Lord would utter the *promise* unrestrictedly, and in all its emphasis of attractiveness, He assures to *every one* (without distinction, τίς) who serveth Him, the great prerogative, nowhere else so fully expressed as here, τιμήσει αὐτὸν ὁ πατήρ. This is the correlative of His own δοξασθῆναι: honour and glorious

manifestation in addition to the saved and regained life. What shall be done to the man whom the blessed and only Potentate, the King of all kings, the Creator of the universe, *the Father* of Jesus Christ delighteth to *honour* to the utmost? (Esther vi. 6.) Here are all our anticipations weak before the unimaginable height and glory of our assured hope.

Vers. 27, 28. But there is a sudden change in the intense thought and feeling of our Lord, such as we often find Him exhibiting in testimony that the Son of man is one of ourselves (but most often towards the close, and in St John especially); and *now* the Lord is seized by an affrighting apprehension of that conflict of suffering and death unto victory, of which He had so serenely spoken. Not "confounded" (as the Berlenb. Bib. translates), but *amazed* is His soul, moved to its depths by the disquietude and terror of the coming *hour*. We have here a prelude to Gethsemane, the lamentation, the petition, the resignation, all now even as then. St John's record of this crisis of foretaste is as real as the synoptical record of the subsequent consummate conflict; the two accounts explain and supplement each other. We have no more now to say, preparatorily to a deeper exposition when we reach Gethsemane, than that it must have been more than a mere mortal apprehension of death, it must have been a conflict and agitation of a peculiar and unshared kind, which could thus disturb the Son of God as the Son of man while in the midst of His testimony to His own δόξα! And—"He lets us know His feelings," tells us plainly for a witness to all people (ver. 29)—Now is my soul troubled! Not as if the overpowering might of passion had constrained this utterance:—we see that He afterwards in perfect self-possession commanded the outburst of His sorrow and dismay, until the time and the witnesses were appointed. (Matt. xxvi. 36, 37.) But it is His *will* not to conceal it, and even this mightiest passion is exhibited in the calmness of connected, progressive, and measured words.

All the typical appeals and supplications of the Psalms, in which, with various application, the cry so often recurs, My soul is cast down (Ps. xlii. 7 literally), and, Lord, be Thou my helper—reach in the lips of our Lord their full, distinctive, *Messianic meaning*. And it is not without significance, that

here and at Gethsemane alone does Jesus say concerning Himself, *My soul*—which is to be distinguished from His *spirit*. Father, save Me! has been by many punctuated and explained as still a *question;*[1] but to us this is quite improper, as well as unreal. To our feeling, it is inharmonious to make a prayer, which springs from the deepest impulse, begin with a question —*Should I* so pray? so speak? Further, the Lord does not speak in any doubt or uncertainty—What should I *choose?* but merely—What shall I *say?* But this must be rightly understood! The *two opposites* pressed hard upon Him, in an infinitely deeper and more actual sense than upon His Apostle afterwards:—the cry for help, and submission to the Father's counsel. (Bengel: concurrebat horror mortis et ardor obedientiæ.) Human language is not sufficient for the *combined utterance* of both, as both were perfectly combined in Him,—hence the τί εἴπω. Therefore He utters them one after the other, the one being as earnest and solemnly intended as the other.[2] First the human dismay—Help *Me!* but immediately follows the cry, which coincides with the perfect submission of Gethsemane,—Glorify *Thy* name! The intermediate foundation of both is a clause which on account of the διὰ τοῦτο demands a nearer contemplation.

It does not admit of question, after the evidence of all the Evangelists, that by *this hour* we must understand the time which had been so often declared to be *not yet* come, but which had now arrived in its immediate preparatory tokens; the time, that is, of His final specific suffering unto death, of His distinctive atoning passion. Certainly, there lies in the expression itself an allusion to the *transitoriness* of even this crisis, as παραυτίκα ἐλαφρὸν (2 Cor. iv. 17) in comparison with eternity; but, on the other hand, the same word describes the oppressive might of the temporal *present*, of the νῦν, into which the Son of God appearing as the Son of man in earthly life and earthly expe-

[1] Griesbach, Knapp, Schott, Hahn, Schulz, Lachmann do so; and Schleiermacher adopts this interpretation.

[2] Lampe: Sed tamen ab alterâ quoque parte non caret difficultate, si admittitur *interrogatio*, quod tum Jesus videatur *corrigere* velle verba, *quæ in se erant æquissima*, quæque argumentum precum Messiæ secundum prophetias esse debebant.

rience had so profoundly sunk, that there remains for Him only a cup which He must drink to the last drops, a baptism of all but overwhelming violence from without;[1] and not only so, but the peculiar and unexampled intensity of this death-passion of the Living One, of this sin-bearing of the Holy One, from the might of which alone our suffering derives its virtue to insure our δόξα, exhibits to us *in this suffering* a corresponding—καθ' ὑπερβολὴν εἰς ὑπερβολὴν αἰώνιον βάρος θλίψεως. This emphatic significance of the word ὥρα of itself confutes the view which Baum.-Crusius gives of the intermediate clause:—"Here must αὕτη ἡ ὥρα mean something different, namely, the present time *of His life*, and the meaning is, The circumstances of My whole lifetime have led Me into a constant conflict with sufferings!" Oh no, this meaning is quite discordant with this normal language of the Spirit; and we nowhere find in Scripture that the entire life of any man is termed an hour;[2] most assuredly *this hour* here is the same in the second as in the first clause, and that distinction disturbs the impressive emphasis of the connection. As certainly as the νῦν τετάρακται holds its truth, even so the Lord may justly say thereof—ἦλθον εἰς τὴν ὥραν ταύτην. But what means the διὰ τοῦτο therewith? The expression of emotion is pregnant and hints out its meaning. Are we to understand, with Olshausen, "in order to redeem mankind, and finish My work?" That involves something not *now* expressed, hinted at only in the much fruit of ver. 24; but the τοῦτο must mean something nearer and more obvious, if it were only because of its condensed and pregnant utterance. Consequently, that also is too far-fetched, which Lücke supplies:—the hour that the Son of man should be glorified: and we agree with Kling[3] in rejecting this, and clinging to Bengel's perfectly unexceptionable view—Propterea *veni* in hanc horam, ut venirem in hanc horam, eamque exantlarem. Thus only, according to our feeling, is justice done to this most impressive utterance, in which the most vehement ταράσσεσθαι is accompanied by the most tranquil self-possession, and which has no other meaning than the οὕτω δεῖ γενέσθαι of Matt. xxvi. 54.

[1] Compare our observations upon the *cup* and *baptism* in vol. iii.

[2] Although Klopstock's well-known hymn terms this life only a brief *hour*—in contrast with eternity.

[3] Stud. u. Krit. 1836, 3. 675.

And the Berlenb. Bible is not far amiss—"Would I be saved out of this hour, I must first enter thoroughly into it." Luthardt too, He says now, "for this cause, that I might drink of this cup to the dregs, and exhaust it, have I placed it to My lips." In *this* application, finally, are we to seek the depth of the meaning, as Bengel intimates it by his *exantlare*. The διὰ τοῦτο, that is, refers immediately to the preceding σῶσόν με; the thought which harmonises the great contradiction, which unites in one the supplication for help and the resignation to God's will, and which perfectly responds to the τί εἴπω; is no other than this:—The entering into this hour is the being brought out of it, the suffering is itself the deliverance! And thus the tranquillised soul reposes in the prelude of victory which sounds in the final clause,—Father, glorify only Thy name! Certainly, there is in these words also the feeling which Bengel expresses —quovis impendio mei, not as My *horror mortis* would with its σῶσόν με, but as Thou wilt! Nevertheless, this glorification is not of the Father Himself, which first fully comes out in ch. xvii. 1, 4 (see, however, ver. 6); but of His *name*, of that revelation of Himself in the Son which again is one with the glorification of the Son of man, ver. 23. This the Son knoweth, and thus He returns at the close of His words to the thought with which they began.

The significance of this crisis is great, and is but dimly apprehended by those who see here only a parenthetical occurrence, having its origin in a momentary emotion. The *three* voices from heaven, by which the Father spake over the Son, indicate to us the right way to regard it. At the beginning, in the middle, and at the end of the Messiah's course respectively, there was given to Jesus such a high and most distinctive attestation; and all three times in relation to the assumption on the part of the self-sacrificing Son of His *destiny of death*. "The third time had Jesus now solemnly announced His destiny of death; as first in the presence of the Baptist, the second time before the Lawgiver and the Prophet of the Old Testament, so now in the holy place of sacrifice itself, in the tabernacle of

God. And the third time does the voice like thunder resound, by which the Father accredits the Son and justifies His work." (Ebrard.) Moreover, the progression in *publicity* which is evident in these three occasions must be distinctly noted; the perfect contrast between *this* voice as uttered before all the people in the temple, and the first still revelation between John and Jesus alone.

We shall not involve ourselves with the question, which has been very foolishly dealt with by too many, as to whether the later and dubious doctrine of the Jews concerning the Bath Kol, audible since the period of the second temple, is to be introduced here. This notion of the Rabbins had by no means become an article of popular faith, for the people on the present occasion think of nothing of the kind. We must not here, any more than at the Baptism and Transfiguration (let not these parallels be overlooked!), think of any mere omen-like קול or *βροντή*, the signification of which in the Spirit (the daughter of this voice) Jesus might first have uttered or heard. The assumption of an immediate voice from heaven does *not* rest (as de Wette says, Stud. u. Krit. 1834. 4. 939) upon an "indistinctness of thought;" but upon the plain and certain record of St John, whose words allow no other supposition than that it *was* an actual voice, uttering the cited words. We may admit the circumstance, related with equal plainness, that a portion of the people nevertheless heard only thunder, without by any means admitting "that the people's sense of hearing declares it to have been no other than a sound like thunder." This was, indeed, the sense of the most unsusceptible of *the people;* but others, though de Wette rejects them, heard what they term an actual *λελάληκεν*, ascribed by them to an angel. That *St John* heard and understood the words of the *φωνή* is to be gathered from his plain statement, which records them with the same historical simplicity as all the rest; and when he says that only the people misunderstood the sound, it is implied that all the *disciples*, at least, understood them equally with himself.[1] "The

[1] Klee: "The disciples doubtless understood: otherwise St John would not have failed to remark that they did not hear or apprehend the words. It is the people whom he exhibits as entirely or partially mistaking the sound."

Evangelist declares it to have been no more than a supposition of the people, that thunder had been heard"—as Kling very properly says. The loud and awful voice was, indeed, "like thunder;" but it was at the same time an articulately speaking *voice*. Now such an objective mystery as this, a sound from heaven, from the world of spirit, demands most assuredly a specific susceptibility on the part of earthly man, if it is to be rightly perceived and apprehended by him:[1] *hence* the half-hearing of the people then, just as in the present day, when, amid the plainest and most articulate preaching of the glorification of Jesus in the word and power of the Holy Ghost—an ὄχλος ἑστὼς καὶ ἀκούσας often hears nothing but a *thundering*, a mere *predication*. For, as Hamann says, "before men will see (hear) and believe in God, they will resort to all kinds of imaginations of thunder and angels." A mere literal thunder, however, as the voice of the Father over the Son, which He must then interpret as in the case of the Bath Kol of the Jews, is altogether derogatory to His honour: he who feels not this is beyond the reach of argument.

The words themselves, as they give an assuring answer, not, however, with a simple δοξάσω but with καὶ ἐδόξασα as the foundation of that, have been for the most part either wholly misunderstood or interpreted in a very narrow way. That view of them which, under various modifications, refers the καὶ ἐδόξασα to the present crisis, has a strong appearance of profundity. Bengel: "By the word *I have glorified*, the entrance of Christ upon that hour is accepted; by the word *I will glorify*, there is promised the glorification of the Father's name through the glorification of Christ by His passion. To the twofold speech of Jesus, the twofold reply of the Father corresponds." So von Gerlach, with a somewhat different application: "The Father had already glorified His name *internally*, through the perfect *obedience* of the Son, who had surrendered Himself up in perfect sacrifice through His whole life, and now once more most fully; and He would glorify it again when this offering of the Son should be *externally perfected*, and He Himself, through

[1] "The necessity of a fit disposition of the organ, however, does not by any means remove an objective matter into the domain of the internal."

His resurrection and ascension, should be acknowledged before all the world." And Brandt goes still further: assuming that the name was already glorified in the present victory of the wrestling spirit of Jesus, and that "the True and Faithful One now assured Him that in His future similar, but more sharp and continuing agony, He should once more most gloriously conquer." Whatever semblance of right all this may have, we regard it as too petty an interpretation of the Father's voice, which now (as on the two former occasions) must embrace and express the whole eternal relation, entering into time and passing beyond it, of the Father to the Son; and every immediate reference to this crisis itself must be too narrow, for the καὶ ἐδόξασα καὶ δοξάσω has a tone which comprehends *all* the Past and the Future. Thus it is no remembrancer of this or that glorification which had already taken place; for (as B.-Crusius rightly says) "the ἐδόξασα and δοξάσω are not to be referred to any *single* circumstance past or future, but to the whole process of the great events." Nor can we understand, with Lange, "in the New Covenant as in the Old;" or, as Schleiermacher better puts it, the contrast between all the past of Divine manifestation and the kingdom which should begin with the death of Christ. This reduplicated word, used emphatically on account of the δόξασον to which it responds, is fundamentally one with the former voices which testified generally—*Thou art My Son!*[1] Thou art My Son, in whom I have ever, since Thou wert, glorified My name; consequently, therefore, as certainly will I glorify it in Thee through Thy *now* beginning passion. Thus, it is the distinction between the past and the future which is here the great *turning-point;* the πάλιν also is no mere continuous or repeating עוֹד, but a simple corroboration; since the true and complete glorification, the renewal and increase, rather the consummation of the former glorification, is still in reversion, as Jesus has said.

Ver. 30. In this simple word of our Lord, which may be read

[1] But the Thou of this address is the Son of man, though as the expected, secretly present angel of the covenant, mediating the revelation of every age. Augustin goes too far back when he adds to the ἐδόξασα—antequam facerem mundum, taken from ch. xvii. 5, to which this belongs. Comp. rather Ps. xxii. 10, 11.

too lightly, there are two things which must be carefully observed. In the first place, the "not" is not an unconditional negation, but only relatively so—*not alone*, or *not so much*. For it is not His design to deny that the voice had a purpose also for Himself, invigorating Him and leading Him onward to the great hour; He does not really contradict (though this has been affirmed) the people's *αὐτῷ λελάληκεν*, for this would involve an application quite inconsistent with His sacred humility, and which we leave such as Strauss to find in it,—But take care not to think that I find necessary for My own person any such assurance and consolation! Had He not prayed? And does not the confirming answer rejoice the Petitioner, even though His perfect assurance from beginning to end lay in the Amen of His own prayer? But it is the publicity and solemnity of *this* last voice from heaven which the Lord now makes so prominent and urges upon their attention. He refutes their words about the thunder by the repeated *φωνή*: but He does not go on to correct their error as to whether an angel, or the Father whom He addressed, had spoken; for that would have been a criticism of their words unseemly at such a crisis, the influence of which should still work on. It is this influence alone which He would carry on and guide. *Although* the people had not heard and understood it, He nevertheless assures them—and this is the second point—that it came for their sake! His *δι' ὑμᾶς* does not refer merely to the more susceptible among them, the commencing disciples, but He makes all "in a certain sense responsible for their understanding, because they might have been able to understand." (v. Gerlach.) This saying may be extended to all the signs and attestations of Jesus which had taken place; all *for our sakes*, that we might hear and believe! But we must carefully apprehend the relative bearings of our Lord's manner of speaking here, as it is condescendingly adapted to the children of men. Essentially and supremely, *all things* are and take place for the *Father's* sake (Heb. ii. 10; Rom. xi. 36), for the glorification of *His* name—the redemption as well as the creation of the world. Thus the Son had just before spoken, for thus only *it became Him* to speak. Nevertheless, He did not the less on that account speak also of His own glorification, yea, He began with that; for all must honour the Son

even as they honour the Father, the honour of God consists conclusively in this, that the Father is honoured in the Son (ch. v. 23, xi. 4, xiv. 13). The passage of ch. xvii. is finally condensed into that one single petition, And now glorify Thou —*Me!* Therefore we rightly supplement the answering voice thus—*ἐδόξασα καὶ δοξάσω μου τὸ ὄνομα*; yet it is not without significance that these last words are wanting, for the answer comprehensively holds good also of ver. 23, and the *absolute* *δοξάζειν* signifies—Me in Thee and Thee in Me! This is that perfect intercommunion of working and love, by which the Son will glorify the Father and the Father the Son. But, once more, this *δόξα* is revealed and perfected in the blessedness of the redeemed, on whom the Father confers the honour (*τιμήσει*, ver. 26), of being capable eternally to honour Him in the Son with body, soul, and spirit. Thus, as Jesus previously thought, in His *διὰ τοῦτο*, of the immediate necessity of His redeeming passion (*this hour*), as the way of transition to eternal glory, and rested serenely in this; so now the observation of the unintelligent people upon the voice brings before Him the *third* fundamental thought, to which He in perfect self-devotion condescended, or, as we may say with equal propriety, in pure and most elevated contemplation raised Himself. Regarding now a world of sinners all was one *δι' ὑμᾶς*. And *to this*, too, the salvation of the world, is subordinated His *δι' ἐμέ*, to be found again; even as the *σῶσόν με* was merged in the honour of the Father. By all this we may clearly comprehend how the deep internal current of our Lord's thought made it necessary that He should now go on to speak of that redemption of the world which His sufferings and self-renunciation should effect.

Ver. 31. But in connection with this comes forward, as naturally as necessarily, the thought of the power of Satan, the false god and anti-god, which is to be abolished. Our dogmatic theology has much work to do, before full justice will be done to *all* the aspects and relations of the mystery of the Cross, as they appear interspersed through Scripture; before they are all gathered into one unity, without the undue preponderance of any,—the revelation of love, the vindication of right, the reconciliation between the world and God, the mortification of sin in the flesh, the abolition of death, the breaking down of Satan's

power. This last aspect of it was more fundamentally viewed and exhibited in the ancient teaching of the church than in modern times; and we may refer in illustration to Oetinger's remark on Luther's Catechism: "Thus the simple notion of *Redemption* is the swallowing up all that in victory which is contrary to man, and caused by Satan."[1] Compare Heb. ii. 14; Col. i. 13, ii. 14, 15, etc., etc.

The *νῦν* is the same immediately impending, already commencing *now* as in ver. 27. The world is not, indeed, to be damningly judged, but redeemed and saved: this very redemption, however, is itself a *judgment*. They miss altogether the deep meaning of this word in this place, who arbitrarily make *κρίσις* without any qualification mean—setting free, salvation, justification. Thus Augustin understood it of the separation of those who were delivered from the devil; Chrysostom substituted an *ἐκδικήσεται ὁ κόσμος ἅπας*; and Cyril, *ἀπαλλάττεσθαι τῆς τοῦ διαβόλου πλεονεξίας*. (See in Klee.) Grotius resorted to an unsound philology—*κρίνειν* sæpe apud Hebræos est in libertatem vindicare. Id quim faciebant שׁוֹפְטִים. No! ch. xvi. 11 must be taken in connection with the present declaration, and consequently the ungodly world is in a certain sense *judged* in its prince, even while it is saved. Thus we cannot solve it by that other interpretation, which is resorted to by most practical expositors; as by Bengel—"*κόσμου* is the genitive of the object; the judgment concerning the world, is as to *who is hereafter to be the rightful possessor of the world*." Assuredly, there is such a process of decision as to who should possess the world, and the judgment becomes for the world an emancipating judgment of grace; yet no otherwise than because the world, *as* the world and ungodly, is subjected to judgment with Satan; inasmuch, that is, as its sin, that which Satan has in it, is judicially abolished and thrown back to Satan whence it came.[2]

[1] In the Wörterbuch s. v. Auskaufen, S. 53. Similarly S. 177 s. v. Erlösung, "In the great word Redemption what a number of thoughts come together! Christ has redeemed us from future condemnation and wrath, from the law, from our vain conversation, from death and from the devil."

[2] Which, however, is not the same with Hilgenfeld's interpolated thought —Now is the world's judgment, and not hereafter only.

Prince of this world is an appellation which now first comes forward, but with which we shall hereafter become more familiar: corresponding to the Rabbinical שַׂר הָעוֹלָם, for the form of our Lord's doctrine lays hold of every element of truth which had been developed rightly from the Old Testament. The Lord further speaks of the devil without any direct external inducement, from His own spontaneous impulse: and His saying is uttered not simply before the disciples and the people, but before the *Greeks*, who, as we found before, were still His hearers, and would be the specific representatives of that which κόσμος to Jewish ears would signify. The glance over the *world of heathenism* is continued in the πάντας of the following verse. It has been rightly observed that never had the prince of this world swayed a more unrestricted and uninterrupted dominion upon the earth, than was exhibited in Heathenism and Judaism at the time when Christ came. But this is the great νῦν, when and from which time forwards, he should be cast out! There is a special emphasis in the ἔξω as added to ἐκβληθήσεται—but *from what?* Theophylact held fast the superficial meaning which a figurative acceptation gives—the casting out from the place of judgment of one who is cast in the suit.[1] In the opposite extreme, something quite inappropriate to our passage (see the exposition in Lu. x. 18) has been found in it by those whom the reading κάτω instead of ἔξω has misled, and who understand the casting down from heaven. (Crusius; out of the πανήγυρις ἀγγέλων [Heb. xii. 22, 23].) Better than this would be the simple *out of the world*, the occupant of which he had hitherto been; out of it as "his territory" (which Luthardt sanctions): —for this is strictly true. Yet since, as the Lord has just said, the world itself in a certain sense is *also* "judged," that modification of the thought is the only perfectly appropriate one, which Grotius (after Euthymius and others) refers to—ἔξω ex voce ἄρχων interpretandum, ἐκ τῆς ἀρχῆς.[2] Of course, it is self-evident that this future, as in the entire work of redemption, is already fulfilled only *jure et potentia;* it is to be fulfilled *facto*

[1] "Removed from the Judge's presence"—as Hofmann (Schriftbeweis i. 396) weakens it.

[2] Nor can we understand why Luthardt should declare this to be "artificial," since "territory" here can be no other than territory of dominion.

et actu gradually, and by a very long progression. This casting out of him who is cast out goes on from age to age down to the final victory.

Ver. 32. The ἐγώ of our Lord takes the place of the ejected ἄρχων; but His new ἐξουσία πάσης σαρκός (ch. xvii. 2), is no other than an *attractive* power exercised upon all whom the usurper can now no longer keep back, if *they* refuse him, and follow the Lord's drawing. That all men might be drawn towards Him, is the fruit and consequence of the *death* of Jesus, as was already declared in ch. x. 15, 16, of that same death which has been the subject of discourse since ver. 23. It is most certain, consequently, that the *lifting up* here, as in ch. iii. 14, and ch. viii. 28, has as direct reference to the dying itself, as to the glorification and universal exhibition attendant upon that dying; and it plainly alludes, as we saw upon those passages, to the *cross*. But it is doing injustice to the Evangelist, to regard his interpretation in ver. 33 as being restricted to the crucifixion alone, especially to the mere externality of the exaltation upon the cross. (Baum.-Crusius: "The Evangelist deems the second signification the only one.") For this σημαίνων[1] which he uses, when compared with ch. xxi. 18, 19, Rev. i. 1, does not mean a plain declaration (as when employed by St Luke in Acts xxv. 27, and xi. 28), but a hinted intimation; and hence the London Heb. New Test., which we so often quote, well renders it by לְהַרְמִין. Nor can we doubt, when we enter as we ought into the profound meaning of St John's words, that in this ποίῳ θανάτῳ (which, indeed, in ch. xviii. 32 does refer only to the kind of death) he designs comprehensively to express all that our Lord had said concerning the significance, the power, and the fruit of His death.[2] For the being lifted up *from the earth* indicates, as

[1] Concerning which Baum.-Crusius arbitrarily decides that "it has the force here neither of an obscure, nor of an incidental, allusion."

[2] Lampe: Phrasis ποίῳ θανατῷ non nude significat *quo genere mortis*, sed in sensu latiori *qualitatem* mortis, etiam *internam* involvit, adeoque ad fructus etiam hujus mortis respicit. Münchmeyer, on the contrary, insists that the ἀποθνήσκειν permits us to think *only* of the manner of death—the significance, power, and fruit of that death being altogether out of the question here! I envy not such a perverse and wilful spirit of exposition. Even the ancient Nonnus inserted—ποίῳ ζωαρκεῖ ποτμῳ.

the Lord here uses it, more plainly than the mere ὑψωθῆναι and ὑψώσητε which had been used before, an emancipating and glorifying power in His death:—the falling *into the earth* of the grain of wheat is now marvellously at the same time an exaltation above the earth, and *this* is symbolically represented by the *cross*. The tree of the curse and of death planted in the earth remains not withered and dry, but grows up towards heaven as the tree of life and blessing.

The reading πάντα, which, as followed by the Vulg., Augustin so strangely expounds, is defended now by no one. As in ch. xiii. 3 πάντα alone could be read, so here it must be πάντας. They *all* are as personal as the prince of this world; they are his subjects now set free, especially the Greeks and heathens:—and thus does the Lord give the late answer for ver. 21. He who being crucified, and by the cross lifted up to heaven, exhibits Himself by His word and Spirit to the souls of men as crucified for them, in all the love of redemption, draws them to Himself by the might of His love: a truth which has in modern times assumed a classical form to all the friends of Missions in the well-known sermon of James of Birmingham on the Attraction of the cross.[1] I will draw them *unto Me:* and this means ultimately, away from the earth into heavenly places (Nonnus: ἐς οὐρανὸν εὐρύν); yet only through the cross, and therefore first of all to Me on the cross.[2] This is in the sense of "where I am" (ver. 26). That before the glorification of Christ (to the world and the individual heart) the Father pædagogically and preparatorily draws to the Son, while afterwards *the Son Himself* draws immediately, is a distinction of great moment, as we have observed upon ch. vi. 44. Finally, let it be clearly apprehended that the promised drawing *of all men* does not insure to all men that they must and will come; for the *drawing* is no *enforcement*, as chap. vi. made clear. Schleiermacher would, indeed, understand the word without any restriction, and founds upon it the hope that the Lord will actually yet redeem all men, and bring the entire human race to salvation. Even Olshausen is disposed to concede that the "draw *to Myself*" might seem to allow no room for the opposing energy of man, and thus give plausibility

[1] Translated into German at Nürnberg, 1820.

[2] Dräseke: "The church is built up around the Cross."

to the doctrine of universal restoration. But let the emphasis be laid upon the first word "*draw* to Myself," and all is plain. Does not the Lord actually draw all men? Does not the absolute predestination theory contradict itself necessarily in all practical preaching, *which is sent* unto all? Does not Augustin himself say—*Si non traheris, roga ut traharis*—?

That the people did certainly understand the Lord's words of *dying*, is made plain by His subsequent "yet a little while." They had heard out of the *law*, that is, here out of *Scripture* generally, something concerning the Messiah's eternal continuance; and, rightly interpreted, their supposition was correct. But they did not hear it aright; and as they now (let it be noted!) take it for granted that Christ is speaking of Himself as the *Messiah*, they find it hard to reconcile His being taken away and lifted up with this abiding. They tell Him this, not apparently with any malicious motive, but as a confident appeal to Him springing from eagerness to know. For *μένειν* in popular use equivalent to not dying, comp. chap. xxi., xxii., xxiii. It has been needlessly sought to find particular passages of Scripture to which the people might refer. Surenhusen supposed that Ps. cx. 4 must be joined with Dan. ii. 44, vii. 13, 14; the eternal priesthood with the eternal kingdom. But there needs not at the outset any particular expressions to establish the universal teaching of Scripture according to the Jewish notion,—that the Messiah would set up a permanent earthly kingdom, and consequently (by a very natural inference) remain ever upon earth.[1] Yet the saying "Son of man" does seem to refer more directly to Daniel; and that even the people assume *Christ* and Son of man to be synonymous, is very important for the establishment of the meaning of the latter phrase as used by Jesus. He had not indeed *now* said, according to St John, If the Son of man be lifted up; but ver. 23 had set out with this expression, and the people had been by Himself accustomed to understand this as a designation of His own person. They are reminded, consequently, of the words of ver. 23; yet this is not all that we are to assume, as Luthardt thinks, who denies all

[1] For the confusion of the Rabbins upon the question, to their blindness incapable of solution, Whether the Messiah should die? compare Eisenmenger Th. ii. Kap. 15, especially from S. 812 onwards.

reference to Dan. vii. For how should that be? This great central prediction was assuredly known mediately to the people, even as the Lord's discourse had pointed to it: only on this supposition could they have understood ver. 23 of the Messiah. They, therefore, conclusively ask,—Or dost Thou speak in this δεῖ ὑψωθῆναι (not a literal quotation of His words, and remarkably coinciding with chap. iii. 14) of a Son of man who is *not* the Christ? Thus we have not, however, hitherto understood Thee (and the Scripture):—resolve us this mystery!

Vers. 35, 36. He does not resolve it to them, nor can He until the great sequel brings its great solution; therefore His answer is not properly speaking an answer, but a reference to the present duty of faith—Only use My light, and all things will soon be clear to you![1] He does not say expressly, either that their opinion concerning the eternal abiding of the Messiah was false, or that it was true: for it is both, according as it is understood. He only confirms the assurance that He Himself will soon go away. His words refer to, and blend, the sayings of chap. vii. 33 and chap. viii. 12; while they are, to the people, the complement of what He had said in chap. ix. 4, 5. He Himself worketh unweariedly as the Light, so long as He is in the world; but they also, on their part, should do the same:—*Your* work is to use the light, by a trusting and obedient *walking* in the way which that light marks out. It is as certain that μεθ' ὑμῶν is a gloss taken from chap. xiii. 33, as it is that ἐν ὑμῖν must here be translated first of all—among you: comp. ἐν αὐτοῖς, chap. xv. 24, with ἔμπροσθεν αὐτῶν here, chap. xii. 37. It is, however, no other than a condescending, though deeply significant, manner of speaking which attributes to them a certain *having* of the light which was only externally offered to them. In this gracious admission there lies, further, the solemn truth, that *for Israel* the prophetic office of Christ must pave the way for the influence of His priestly office. Whosoever altogether failed to hear Him, as He taught and testified, *to him* no new light of life would break forth from the redeeming death; but that which was to the Gentiles a gospel, became to the previously unbelieving Jews, as the result on the mass bore witness,

[1] "He demands from them deeds, disputings served no purpose." (Braune.)

no other than—the loss of light, the entire lapse into darkness (Rom. xi. 15). The same Paul who was sent among the Gentiles with the word of the Cross, to open their eyes, that they should turn from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, had concerning Jerusalem already received the command, Make haste and get thee quickly out: for they will not receive thy testimony concerning Me, as they did not receive Mine concerning Myself. (Acts xxvi. 18, xxii. 18.) A similar result follows wherever a preparatory word of the Lord shines for a while, in order to make and make manifest the distinction between faith and unbelief; and this gives a general application to this much-used warning of our Lord. For the darkness into which the rejected light turns, compare the quite analogous expression in Jer. xiii. 16; and for the walking in the light which goes before (at that time, the light of Scripture and the law), the apocryphal passage, Baruch iv. 1, 2. He who walks in darkness, or would foolishly walk in it, cannot do so, for he seeth not and therefore knoweth not where he goeth: he runneth blindly into the ruin which yawns before his sin. Thus did the Jewish people fall into judgment through their continuous rebellion against God and man; and so is it generally with every man who has neglected the day of his light.

With the saying of ver. 36, Luther took his farewell as translator of Scripture: he placed it at the conclusion of the warning which he appended to the edition of the New Testament of 1545. The *believing* in the light is the preliminary foundation for the *walking;* but that we become *children of light* is the result of the faith which walketh and approveth itself in obedience. *Sons* or *children* of light is not a mere Hebraism; this would be just equivalent to the previous *having*, which indicated only a certain relation to the light: but a new γενεά was to be born of the light.

THE EVANGELIST'S SUMMARY OF THE PUBLIC TESTIMONY OF JESUS.

(Ch. xii. 44–50.)

An orthodox harmony of the first three Evangelists, in combination with the fourth, must show, as we said before, that ἀπελθὼν ἐκρύβη does not imply that our Lord from this time forth uttered no further words in public, and was no more seen by the people. The true parallels are Matt. xxi. 17; Lu. xxi. 37. But it appears to us incredible, taking into account the plan of St John's whole Gospel, and his own final reflections previously, that the Lord should immediately afterwards, and in connection with His concealment, utter aloud the words which follow from ver. 44 to ver. 50. For, from ver. 37 onwards, *the Evangelist* comes forward with his *epilogue* and concluding observations, *because* the Lord had *retired;* and these concluding observations plainly extend in one connection to the end of the chapter. If they are supposed to end with ver. 43, it even then must appear altogether contrary to historical narrative generally, and to St John's in particular, to introduce *after* such a conclusion, and without any further introductory statement, an actual discourse of our Lord. But the final reflection upon the self-condemned unbelief of the Jews, the fruitlessness of the labours of Jesus on the whole, embraces obviously all that follows: it is divided into two parts, speaking first of the many and great *miracles*,[1] of which St John (the others chs. ii. 23, vii. 31, x. 32, xx. 30, being presupposed) had only adduced some of the greatest, and then of the testimony of His *words* by those miracles confirmed, *they* being in themselves the main matter of this spiritual Gospel, as of the Gospel generally. Or, we may say, first of the whole manifestation of His *person* as such, in which the *arm* of the Lord was revealed, yea, in which the *glory of God* was to be seen as certainly as it had been seen by Isaiah (chs. ii. 11, and x. 40, being combined); then, of the *preaching*, ἀκοή or שְׁמוּעָה which

[1] For that in τοσαῦτα a *tanta* must be added to the *tot* (comp. Matt. viii. 10; Lu. vii. 9), is denied by Luthardt without any reason.

is the distinctive test and spring of faith, and the right disposition for which is exhibited in the prophetic quotation of ver. 38. For to believe in *σημεῖα* without the word is a mere negation, since it is the word accompanying, or rather by them accompanied, which elevates them into signs and witnesses which have a meaning. The Jews *could* not believe, because they would not from the beginning and still would not (Theophylact; *τὸ οὐκ ἠδύναντο ἀντὶ τοῦ οὐκ ἤθελον*); and that is the predicted judicial hardening, in the fulfilment of which unbelief itself, far from leading us astray, becomes only a new argument of faith. We have already said, upon Matt. xiii. 14, 15, all that is necessary upon the quotation from Isaiah.[1] Of the *unbelieving* there are, however, according to the little understood meaning of St John, *two* classes; for he regards the altogether unsusceptible and hardened as the great mass, and then adds to them in ver. 42 those who *confess not* in spite of their *ἐπίστευσαν*. For he knows no other genuine and perfect faith than that which confesses.[2] The *ὅμως* before *μέντοι* we do not regard, with almost all, as merely *adversative*, but would translate it, *similarly*;—an interchange with *ὁμῶς*, *ὁμοίως* which philologists[3] find elsewhere, and which occurs certainly 1 Cor. xiv. 7 in the New Testament, and *probably* Gal. iii. 15.[4] Münchmeyer regards this as intolerable—they believed not, *similarly*, many also believed—but he does not understand my meaning, that St John reckons this believing and not confessing as being likewise unbelief, a view which alone suits the whole connection. There may often be much more of that enforced and commencing *πιστεύειν* than we suppose (ch. vii. 48); but it avails not before God until it reveals itself in con-

[1] Richter's Hausbibel has a good practical remark upon the important ver. 41, which the *αὐτοῦ* refers to Jesus (*αὐτόν* ver. 42): "ver. 40 can be understood only when we fix our regard upon the majesty of Christ, the visible image of the invisible God. It is only when we thus see Christ in the spirit that we see the ground of faith and unbelief. In contrast with this light the darkness appears exceeding dark, and *faith alone can rightly condemn unbelief*"—we would interline here, These things saith *John* also after Esaias, who seeth His glory and (in this Gospel) speaketh of Him.

[2] Nicodemus and Joseph, who both confessed Him during and after His judgment, and others like them, are not here included.

[3] Wahl cites Schæfer ad Greg. Cor. p. 631.

[4] Winer's construction of both passages, § 65. 4, does not appear convincing.

fession. In ver. 43 the Evangelist does not simply coincide with the Lord's first word, ch. iii. 19, but his remark is an almost literal citation from ch. v. 44 (according to which, consequently, we must explain the genitives *ἀνθρώπων* and *θεοῦ*); and is thus a testimony in transition that it is his purpose now to *refer back summarily to all the previous discourses of Jesus.*

Thus alone do we understand the following *ἔκραξε καὶ εἶπεν.* But though we concede this to the later expositors, it should not therefore be alleged against us that our arguments elsewhere, against such an introduction of the Evangelist's own hand, have no force. This case is very different from that of ch. iii. 16. In that chapter everything testifies for the Lord's immediate utterance of the words; but here St John gives us indubitable tokens that he himself is recapitulating. The older expositors, who down to the time of Michaelis and Morus lost sight of this, show us by this example how little their laborious exegesis penetrated the profound and real connection. Lampe makes the Lord utter vers. 44–50 *in ipso discessu*, quasi protestatione solenni factâ; Bengel thinks the same, and says that the *ἐκρύβη* was anticipated by St John as appropriate to *ἔτι μικρὸν χρόνον*, ver. 35. But this seems to us a forced supposition, after *ταῦτα ἐλάλησεν* and *ἀπελθών*, and such a resumption of His discourse, after a long intermediate reflection of the Evangelist's, is quite untenable. Hess thinks the discourse was uttered "soon afterwards, probably on the Thursday," while Ebrard (here at one with Strauss) seems confident that the Lord had so spoken on an *earlier* occasion; but the one, as well as the other, is glaringly out of harmony with the whole cast of the record as given by St John. Kling defends the old hypothesis, and so does Luthardt, most unconditionally. We agree, indeed, with Kling especially, that ver. 36 does not imply the future perfect silence of Jesus; but he is obliged to note it as singular that St John does not give after his manner the circumstances and occasion of this *κράζειν* in ver. 44. *Singular* enough, most assuredly! Besides this, how strange that this supposed discourse of Jesus should, to an extent of which there is no previous example, consist of *repetitions* alone, and, moreover, of only such words as are already found in St John's Gospel. Did the Lord ever *recapitulate* in this style, uttering connectedly so long a discourse with-

out any new thoughts and distinctive sayings? Much as we contend against others for repetitions in His discourses on other occasions, here we most decidedly deny it. But, conversely, here where for once St John recapitulates, seeming (though only seeming) to put his words into the Lord's lips, what an instructive example he gives us, not venturing to add (single turns of expression not reckoned) anything of his own. Yea, verily, all this the Lord *had said*, each saying in its season; but St John unites them all retrospectively together. And in this we agree with J. D. Michaelis, Morus, Kuinoel, Olshausen, Tholuck, Lücke, Meyer, B.-Crusius, Fikenscher, v. Gerlach, and Richter.[1] Lange, too, thinks rightly that the Evangelist here embraces the discourses of our Lord in significant sayings, according to his living remembrance; and Alford agrees with the later expositors. The aorists ἔκραξε καὶ εἶπεν are not, however, mere pluperfects. That would be very harsh:—Thus had He ever cried and testified that He demanded only faith in (their) God in His person; thus had He never ceased His endeavour to convince their minds and even their faith. But their signification is that of *wont*, that of a customary and abiding course of repeated action, parallel with ὡμολόγουν and ἠγάπησεν before, as Lücke rightly says. B.-Crusius well says, "He continuously thus uttered His loud declaration"—we may interline again, As the reader of this Gospel will remember. Brückner further remarks, with critical truth, "by the δέ, the loud declarations of Jesus, the substance of which were now to be given, are

[1] This last adds: "It is not *impossible* that Christ should have delivered this compendium of His last (*last?*) discourses, now at His final (*final?*) departure from the temple—as a concluding protest." It may not be impossible, but it seems in the highest degree improbable, to us, at least, inconceivable, and of itself unsanctioned by any hint in St John. Luthardt has advanced nothing new or convincing against our reasons, for the "deep significance of the unbelief of the Jews" cannot be regarded as the overlooked new element of this direct discourse of Jesus;—He had often already spoken on that point. It is *possible*, of course, that Jesus might have now *before His disciples* given a final declaration as to the consequences of the people's unbelief. As to this, we must, with Besser's Polemik, leave every man to his own feeling. But we most confidently protest against the idea of our Lord's recapitulation. Braune, it may be added, is constrained to decide for an apostrophe of Jesus in the hearing of His disciples.

placed in *opposition* to the unconfessing faith of the ἄρχοντες, ver. 42, 43"—a remark which of itself appears to us to be decisive.

But we cannot admit that these are "only isolated sentences without any strict internal connection." St John has a plain connection of his own; even as every preacher might now condense for himself extracts into an important whole, and perhaps should do so sometimes instead of his own incessant preaching and expounding. The comprehensive ground-thought is—The guilt of unbelief rests solely with Israel. Thus it is the same which the Lord Himself afterwards says in ch. xv. 22, or even in Matt. xxiii. 37. The *ground* and cause of this is placed first, vers. 44–46: He that believeth in Me doth no more than believe in the Father that sent Me, *for* he that seeth Me seeth Him—Thus am I come as *light!* (Correlative to *life*, ver. 50, according to the prologue; although this light hath *blinded* their eyes!) Then, in vers. 47, 48, the *consequence* of their self-condemnation is deduced from this; and in vers. 49, 50, this is again carried back to the previously stated ground, and it remains—I have spoken and speak what the Father hath given Me for the everlasting life of all who believe.

After this, there remains but little to be said upon the individual sayings, save to refer to the citations; though much is to be learned from the living and free manner in which previous sayings are here reproduced and combined in a new concert of their fundamental thoughts. The greater is the measure of the Spirit in the disciples of Jesus,—of *that* Spirit, namely, who does not teach the Teacher (as an Ishmaelite pseudo-Paraclete overpowering the Christ), but takes of His fulness,—the greater will be the *freedom* from the letter in the acceptation and reproduction of His words. Hence the fourth Evangelist as "initiatissimus mente Christi" is somewhat otherwise "tenacissimus verborum" than the three preceding; hence in the ancient church, and in all ages, the unliteral citation which we find in the writings and words of some saints. But this has its rigorous limitation; and is to be carefully fenced against perversion by the strictest literality in other cases, which expressly require it. Thus St John gives us here, just at the point between the public and the confidential discourses of Jesus, the explanation

of the manner in which he has apprehended and narrated His discourses. We find all that he here includes under the ἔκραξε καὶ εἶπεν, more or less literally in former discourses; but where the unliteralness *almost* passes over into a new construction of thought and language—no more than this can be said—we may assume that the Lord had actually so spoken, although His words had not been previously recorded.

Ver. 44. Compare ch. v. 24–38, πιστεύειν τῷ πέμψαντι being here elevated into πιστεύειν εἰς τὸν πέμψαντα; for the fundamental thought we may add ch. vii. 16, viii. 42. *Not on Me*—this first denies the so-called mere human personality of Christ, the *self* separated or distinguished from God in any sense; and then it intimates, further, that faith assuredly comes or passes on through Him to God, through the Son to the Father, as the apostolical doctrine teaches us, *e.g.*, 1 Pet. i. 21; Heb. vii. 25.

Ver. 45. In the literal expression this comes *afterwards*, ch. xiv. 9; but in this report of public words θεωρῶν is somewhat more general than the strict ἑωρακώς of that passage, and in the sense of ch. vi. 40 is parallel with πιστεύων. In the former discourses, ch. viii. 19 most closely corresponds with a combination of ch. x. 30, 38. But the words are not to be rationalistically qualified away, with Hess in his paraphrase: "he who more closely contemplates Me, will learn in Me to acknowledge the Father." Rather should it be understood in the sense of the previous words of St John, that Isaiah in the revelation of Jehovah saw the glory of Christ.

Ver. 46. This connects itself immediately with ver. 35 of this same chapter, and is a new argument—for assuredly the Lord did not repeat the very same words in the same sense so soon. But it still more closely corresponds with ch. viii. 12 and ix. 5, the ἐλήλυθα being taken from ch. iii. 19. The only peculiarity in the construction is μείνῃ, which simply gives expression to the thought which was self-understood in all the former utterances of the same truth, that before and independently of our faith in Him we are all naturally in darkness.

Ver. 47. See ch. iii. 17, v. 45, viii. 15. The new construction of the expression seems here more considerable, but it is only through the combination of various sayings for this place. The

hearing and nevertheless not believing corresponds precisely to the prophecy of ver. 40; comp. Matt. xiii. 13, *βλέποντες οὐ βλέπουσι καὶ ἀκούοντες οὐκ ἀκούουσιν.* The old misapprehension, that there is here a promise of *οὐ κρίνεσθαι ἀλλὰ σώζεσθαι* for all who truly hear, before the condemnation of the *ἀθετεῖν*, ver. 48, follows, was occasioned by the false omission of the *μή*. Equally false, even with *μή*, is the reading *φυλάξῃ*, which Grotius, Griesbach, Schott, and Lachmann approve; although the Vulgate has custodierit,[1] and the Peshito renders וְלָא נָטַר. For believing, or rather *not believing*, is the main idea here; but the *φυλάσσειν* would too obscurely express this, and would refer rather to the stedfast continuance in faith, whereas the previous sentences all point to the one idea of the first and great separation of unbelief.

Ver. 48. See further ch. iii. 18. The construction of an almost new thought in this summary is here most conspicuous; and we might be inclined to assume a literal reference to some unrecorded word, though without that it would still be an actual *utterance of Jesus* through His Spirit in St John. The church may always regard it as such, even as I should in preaching upon it; for it is Jesus Himself who is speaking in this summary recapitulation of His discourses by the Evangelist.[2] The *μὴ λαμβάνειν* suggests ch. iii. 11, and *ἀθετεῖν* the synoptical expression Luke x. 16. It is not merely a despising, but a scornful and utter rejection instead of the *λαμβάνειν*. That the spoken word itself (with a strong, as it were personal and living *ἐκεῖνος*) will be the Judge, is a bold and true expression, since it is not an empty word, it can never be spoken in vain. On the one hand, it abides as a judge (Heb. iv. 12) in the memory and conscience till the last day (*ἔχει*); and, on the other, it will on that day, though only for condemnation, be reproduced in the mouth of the rejected Saviour, then the Judge. *Λόγος* is, of course, not an isolated word; but the sum and substance of all the *ῥήματα* which they had heard.

Ver. 49. Here again, as the convincing conclusion approaches,

[1] But Erasmus, crediderit.

[2] Besser admits this without hesitation; and his dealing with me is altogether more prudent, and therefore more friendly, than the usual manner of the Luther. Zeitschrift.

the reference to past utterances is most plain. *This* was said by the Lord many times; we mention only ch. v. 30, vii. 16, 17, 28, 29, viii. 26, 28, 38, 55, comp. ch. v. 19, and afterwards to the disciples ch. xiv. 10. The peculiarity of the verse lies partly in ἐντολὴν ἔδωκε, on which we have spoken, ch. viii. 55; partly in the all-embracing and emphatic τί εἴπω καὶ τί λαλήσω. These synonymous words have been laboriously distinguished in various ways. Rupert supposes that λαλήσω stands in opposition as a future,—and what I at *the last day* shall speak as Judge. But this will not apply to this summary of the rejected words of Jesus which God had put into His mouth (Deut. xviii. 18, 19), as vers. 48 and 50 show; and the ἐντολή is suitable to a state of humiliation alone. Lampe, similarly, would make the difference one of time—what I have hitherto said, and what I should now say, *is the conclusion of all;* but this of course falls with the assumption that Jesus Himself is still speaking. Ambrose thought of the distinction between private speaking and public teaching;[1] but the public testimony alone is here concerned. More consistent with the verbal synonymy is that which Theophylact advanced, who would distinguish the substance of what was said from the form of the expression (comp. πῶς ἢ τί Luke xii. 11): but in that case τί καὶ πῶς should be found instead of the redoubted τί. After the analogy of the Heb. אֲמַר and דָּבַר some have thought of the *præcepta*, or *promissa* as Lampe quotes from Gerhard. B.-Crusius would explain it as the *general* and the *particular*, but this is altogether without foundation. Fikenscher's view is very significant: "The *saying* refers to the hearers who hear the sayings of another; the *speaking* refers to the teacher who proclaims the truth. Jesus had fulfilled His vocation, as well in reference to men, who should find the way of truth, as *in reference to Himself as divinely commissioned* to declare the final revelation of God." In fact, if there must be a distinction, this one would most aptly suit the connection;—What I should *say to you* for salvation and what I should *speak* as the truth of God. But the uncertainty and variety of these distinctions are sufficient to induce us to decline them altogether, and rather to understand the emphasis of the twofold expression

[1] As Nonnus similarly expresses a softer and a louder speaking: ἀνδράσιν ἀγορμένοις τί φθέγξομαι ἢ τὶ βοήσω.

as Brandt does:—"Jesus declares His words to be *without distinction*, thus forbidding us to make distinction, the words of His Father, words which were *all of them* given Him of God." Thus the *τί καὶ τί* is equivalent to *ὅσα ἂν*, embracing every one of them, whether His words be termed *εἰπεῖν* or *λαλεῖν*.

Ver. 50. For the *οἶδα* comp. especially chap. iii. 11, v. 32, viii. 55; and for life everlasting chap. iii. 15, v. 24, vi. 40. *Ἐντολή* does not stand here for the word itself given to Him and then declared, nor must the *ἐστί* be flatly solved in the manner of Glassius—causa vel organon, per quod obtinetur vita æterna. Still less is *ἐντολή* to be taken in the legal sense; but it is just as in ver. 49 the *commission* received from God, to which as the Son of man He must ever remain faithful, comp. chap. x. 18—here, however, it is the commission what He should speak and testify. This commission *is*, in its ground and aim, according to its design and indwelling power, no other than life everlasting for all who believe. It is the *will* of God that all who receive the Son should receive and preserve life. Chap. vi. 39, 40. *This* embraces the true concluding idea of the entire recapitulation:—Jesus had thus faithfully spoken, that all according to the Father's will and His own might be saved if they would.

THE WASHING OF THE FEET, AND ITS SIGNIFICATION.

(Chap. xiii. 7–20.)

Before we enter upon the subject itself, and consider the words in which Jesus explains His own action, we must determine the period of its occurrence: for, the action derives its special significance from its time, as the Evangelist gives us plainly to understand; and, moreover, a much-contested difficulty upon this point demands our attention. We would not expose ourselves to the censure of evading these difficulties; but we will be all the more brief, because the question has been already treated with such superabundant prolixity, that the independent investigator has at command everything that enters into its solution.

The commencing words *πρὸ δὲ τῆς ἑορτῆς τοῦ πάσχα* occasion

but very slight obscurity, as Lücke admits:—"this definition of the time does not require us to regard John as deviating from the Synoptical chronology." The same Evangelist who in chap. xii. 1 has reckoned the days, would have expressly said "one day before," if that had been his meaning. So that we can hardly understand the ἑορτή, after Joseph. Archæol. 3, 10, 5, as referring to the more restricted ἑορτὴ τῶν ἀζύμων which followed the day of the paschal sacrifice; the phraseology of Luke xxii. 7, Matt. xxvi. 17 is itself decisive against that.[1] Thus πρό simply signifies a short time previously, immediately before; and indicates the δεῖπνον to be the paschal meal and the beginning of the feast itself, the προεόρτιον. (Why ver. 29 should render this improbable to de Wette we cannot perceive.) The statement manifestly becomes thus more and more definite, and reaches its highest point of precision in the δείπνου γενομένου, the true meaning of which we shall afterwards discuss. Lange correctly remarks that πρὸ τῆς ἑορτῆς is closely connected with ἐγείρεται, ver. 4: but such a specific action as the rising from a seat is not reckoned by days but by hours and minutes: and consequently it is here—a few moments before the beginning of the feast He rose up. Thus this supper, at which the washing of the feet took place, is by no means an ordinary "supper" (as the absence of the article, quite natural in such a phrase, has been urged), quite distinct from the Synoptic paschal meal, the previous Wednesday, or, as has been said, in Bethany.[2] For, St John's narrative carries everything on in strict connection from this point down to chap. xiv. 31, and xviii. 1, so that *this* δεῖπνον is followed by the going forth to Gethsemane. The Hirschberg Bible has remarked that if the indication of the betrayal, given here vers. 21–30, had taken place already one or two days before, the amazement of the disciples when the Lord uttered the same at the paschal feast, as narrated by the Synoptics, would be inexplicable.[3] Further, the parallel Luke xxii. 27 (as observed by

[1] The reference of this intimation of time to εἰδώς simply (Jesus already knew before the passover—!) has been defended recently by Baumlein and Luthardt; but we must reject it still, for St John always, when defining the day, refers to the event which follows.

[2] The Pers. trans.—two days before the feast.

[3] Richter's Hausbibel (to put an end to all confusion, which will not be the result, however, of this notion!) adopts this opinion of many, including

Olshausen) evidently shows that our Lord at the paschal meal washed the feet *as a servant*—for those words are His own reference to the act. And this was obviously not only before the institution of the Lord's Supper (which we must thus interpose at its right place in St John), but also before *the proper supper*. For we cannot conceive that the contention related by St Luke took place *after* the washing of the feet and the Sacrament.[1] Nor was (according to Lücke) "the supper *interrupted* by the feet-washing, which was so foreign to the prescribed paschal ritual, that we can find no place for it in the paschal meal." For the ἐκ in ἐκ τοῦ δείπνου, ver. 4, is groundlessly urged (since Gerhard) as signifying the completion of the meal, because among the Greeks ἐκ δείπνου, ἐξ ἀρίστου so occurs; δείπνου γενομένου, ver. 2 (for which there is a single false reading γινομένου) is certainly to be translated, according to Meyer's correction of Luther—when the supper arrived, was ready, about to proceed, comp. chap. xxi. 4. This brief expression, unaccompanied by any record of any δεῖπνον, and what kind, appointed, assures us (without the article which Brückner insisted upon) that a reference must be presupposed to the well-known last meal of our Lord πρὸ τῆς ἑορτῆς, that is, ἐν τῷ προεορτίῳ, in the transition between the evenings. The Vulg. (followed, of course, by Klee and Friedlieb) is altogether wrong in its cænâ factâ; for it is this striking action of our Lord, which St John records, that when they were already seated and about to begin, He *rises* again ἐκ τοῦ δείπνου, and afterwards, in ver. 12, sat down again to the proper meal (vers. 23–26).[2]

Thus it is preliminarily certain, and very generally now acknowledged, that this meal of St John is the paschal meal of the Synoptics, and that the feet-washing took place before the

Bengel; but it finds little acceptance now, and the view of the latter is highly forced that St John hastens over a whole day between vers. 30 and 31.

[1] On the other hand, we must not assume, with Ebrard, that the contest arose because no one would undertake the service of washing the feet! The φιλονεικία either referred to their places, or sprang, generally, as at other times, from their carnal notions of the kingdom, if not specifically from the words just spoken concerning it. (See afterwards our exposition in vol. vi.)

[2] It may be proved that the passover was not then eaten standing; and in any case, they had not yet reached that point.

institution of the Supper. But how is it that, according to the Synoptics, Jesus then ate the paschal lamb; while, according to John xviii. 28 and xix. 14, the Friday of His death was the day on which the Jews *made ready to eat the passover?* This question, which in the most ancient time was regarded by no one as a real contradiction, and was never mentioned in the Easter controversy, has assumed a very threatening aspect in our latest criticism. The ancient assumption, which began with Chrysostom and Tertullian, that the Lord partook of His passover *one day earlier* than the people and the Pharisees (on grounds differently viewed, and either alone or with a part of the Jews), is now unhesitatingly rejected; and they either solve the difficulty by some other artificial means, or leave the Synoptics under the imputation of a *hopeless difference*, or *manifest error.*

Among the artificial methods of extrication which are untenable I include the attempted explanations which have been given to the two opposing passages, John xviii. 28 and xix. 14; although Wieseler and others defend them. The formula *φαγεῖν τὸ πάσχα* must have, in my judgment, the same meaning in the fourth Evangelist which it has in the other three; it is most harsh to refer it in the former only to the subsequent passover eating, the *ἄζυμα* or even the חֲגִיגָה. In this we concur with Lücke and Ebrard, that "it must be ever incomprehensible wherefore St John should have used so altogether uncommon an expression: (comp. Joseph. Ant. III. x. 5, where the *ἑορτὴ τῶν ἀζύμων* is strictly distinguished from the *ἑορτὴ τοῦ πάσχα*, similarly II. xv. 1; XI. iv. 8, etc.). It is true that in Deut. xvi. 2, as צֹאן וּבָקָר shows, "the remaining legal offerings and meats of the whole feast" are included under the collective name פֶּסַח. But we cannot (like Hofmann, Weiss. u. Erf. ii. 201) appeal to this passage; for we discover again from another passage, 2 Chron. xxxv. 7, 8, 9 (cited by Wieseler himself) that, properly speaking, only the כְּבָשִׂים וּבְנֵי עִזִּים are mentioned as פְּסָחִים or paschal victims; and, moreover, the collective name, as *including* this essential פֶּסַח, is a very different thing from the collective name, as given to the feast, *exclusive* of and *after* the essential meal. In the *ἵνα φάγωσι*, coupled with *τὸ πάσχα* having the article, it is incontrovertibly meant that they had eaten

hitherto in no sense of the word Passover.[1] Finally, 2 Chron. xxx. 22 has וַיֹּאכְלוּ אֶת־הַמּוֹעֵד so expressly, that we see how impossible it would have been to substitute there הַפֶּסַח. With *φαγεῖν*, and this is the main point, *τὸ πάσχα* necessarily retains the restricted sense; as the passages in the Synoptics declare the usage in the time of Jesus. Consequently, the *παρασκευὴ τοῦ πάσχα* cannot signify the Friday in the paschal feast—as we must grant to the opposite side, after all that Wieseler has adduced; but it is no other than the Jewish עֶרֶב הַפֶּסַח[2] (although Luthardt opposes this). For we must certainly take *both* the passages of St John together, for the special meaning of the *τὸ πάσχα*. When this Evangelist in ch. xix. 14 calls the same day *παρασκευὴ τοῦ πάσχα*, concerning which he had previously said, ch. xviii. 28, *ἵνα φάγωσι τὸ πάσχα*, he certainly uses the expression in the same meaning, and *παρασκευὴ* here is not the (in this place meaningless) statement of the day of the week, but corresponds precisely to the *ἵνα φάγωσι*. The passages, Matt. xxvii. 62; Mar. xv. 42; Lu. xxiii. 54, are only an apparent parallel; for St John thinks first of the approaching *Sabbath*, this time a great Sabbath as coinciding with the first feast-day, afterwards in ver. 31, and thus intimates that it was a *παρασκευὴ* in a twofold sense.

Rauch has endeavoured to convince us that the proper passover, in contradistinction from the *ἑορτὴ τῶν ἀζύμων* had already been eaten between the *thirteenth* and fourteenth of Nisan; but this marvellous hypothesis (as Winer calls it), which requires others to uphold it, has never found acceptance, and has been satisfactorily refuted by Lücke, de Wette, Ebrard, and Wieseler. Schneckenburg's attempt, which disturbs all the previous chronology, needs no mention. Are we then led to the conclusion (with Schleiermacher, Lücke, and many others, that the difference is irreconcilable, and the *error* on the side of the Synoptics? Most certainly not! According to Lücke the error sprang from

[1] Bengel's paraphrase was highly arbitrary: "to continue uninterrupted the remaining eating of the passover!" From the feet-washing and the sacrament onwards is the weakest point in Bengel's harmony.

[2] Comp. in addition the passage adduced by Friedlieb (Archäol. d. Leidengesch. S. 129) from the Babyl. Gemara, which contains a tradition that Jesus was hanged on the tree בערב הפסח.

a very early misunderstanding of uncertain traditions, so that the tradition made itself complete by suppositions originating in itself. "*Indeed*"—he says himself, but one would almost think ironically—"if the relation of Matthew springs immediately from the Apostle, *this method of explanation is untenable.*" But we must not let this one passover-stroke take away Matthew from us! Hauff admits "the supposition that the Synoptics adjusted the time of the death of Jesus with the festivals which had been held from the beginning by the Jewish-Christian communities to commemorate these events"—but if we substitute the *Apostle Matthew* for "Synoptics," all such notions must be rejected at once. Nor can we accept of any original "tradition" that "through want of chronological interest in a circumstance which involved questions of so much greater moment, independent of chronology, precision was not at first thought necessary, and the question of dates remained ever after undetermined." For the *chronological* question in *this case* has direct reference to what was of the *highest possible moment* to the first Christians, viz., the connection between the Old Testament and the New, the coincidence of type and fulfilment—for which the time of celebrating Easter formed the firm historical kernel and centre.[1] So that we may be sure that the first Gospel for Israel with its ἵνα πληρωθῇ, and the Apostle Matthew its assured author, would not have erred through indifference upon this point. Tholuck says, "The nature of the holy sacrament, its internal analogy with the Passover, makes it probable in itself that it originated in strict relation with the Passover. We cannot bring ourselves to assume in the Synoptics a failure in remembrance upon so significant an event, the sensible allusions of which were so peculiar and characteristic." B.-Crusius, whom no dogmatic motive influences, thinks any actual difference in the historical record "improbable in relation to a matter so important to the community as was this last meal." Yes, indeed, improbable even to impossibility. We should have to assume (to use the words of a critic against Bleek), "that the Synoptics not only were quite ignorant of the day on which Jesus Christ

[1] Thus there is no ground for Hase's remark, that "the *error* of the Galilæan tradition rose from *taking it for granted* that the Lord's Supper must have been instituted in connection with the Paschal meal."

was put to death, but that their record of it is in flagrant opposition to the most sacred Jewish statutes against executions during the feast!"

For our own part, then, we return, after a thorough examination of all new theories, to the old explanation which has been already mentioned. St John and the Synoptics are alike right. Jesus, with His disciples, ate the Passover on Thursday, when He instituted the supper; the Jews in general ate it on the Friday of His death. So far Ebrard is clear, but he has a new answer to the question how this is to be accounted for: "the eating of the passover proceeded through two days, because it was impossible that the slaying for so enormous a number could be effected in the three evening hours of one single day, and thus the law was of necessity violated; the day was anticipated, the previous day being included in the celebration, and this would be especially the case with the Galilæans and the poorer class." However well-meant and plausible this may be, we altogether reject it, with Wieseler.[1] What other account can we give? The criticism which reconciles scientific investigation with faith in the historical truth of all the Evangelists, including St Matthew, can only decide that Jesus in fact ate the meal one day earlier than the mass or the majority of the people, and that this must have had a specific reason, which can be supplied by supposition alone. Lücke's assertion that "it is impossible to extract from the synoptical text even the semblance of an anticipation of the Passover"—is true, *as far as* this anticipation is an arbitrary act of Jesus Himself; but if any other reason can be assigned, this peremptory verdict must fall. We must not resort to the old refuge of a *πάσχα μνημονικὸν, μνημονευτικὸν* in the case of our Lord; that was something quite different, originating after the destruction of the temple, and the Synoptics speak of the proper Jewish passover. Nor did the Lord, scrupulously obedient to all the Divine commandments (if not to all the appended statutes of men), by His own specific plenitude of authority anticipate the day on account

[1] S. 347 in the note, where also the error concerning the priests' slaying is exposed. We think that the people would rather have built another Jerusalem than have allowed such a departure from the legal day on account of external circumstances.

of the Supper (as Hippolytus assumed), and, besides, St Luke, ch. xxii. 7 speaks of the *ἡμέρα, ἐν ᾗ ἔδει θύεσθαι τὸ πάσχα.*[1] What then are we to suppose? That which in itself is not unimaginable, that in the computation of that time, as in many other things, an interruption or derangement had crept in among the Jews. Although *ὅτε ἔθυον* stands in Mar. xiv. 12, yet we do not see why, in connection with *οἱ μαθηταί*, the whole people must necessarily be the subject of this *ἔθυον*; but are disposed to find in St Luke's *ἔδει*, in spite of the protest of recent critics, the hint of anticipation which has been found wanting, a tacit opposition to the prevalent practice of others. So that Jesus, in common with a portion of the Jews, *properly* and *legally* held sacred the *contested day*, which the predominant party had displaced in favour of the following.

An analogous example of a slighter difference is furnished by the controversy over the בֵּין הָעַרְבַּיִם, Ex. xii. 6. The Karaites and Samaritans understood the time *after* the going down of the sun till entire darkness, the Pharisees and Rabbanites explained it of the decline of the day *before* sundown (רוּחַ הַיּוֹם) as the first evening; the latter in the time of Josephus was the prevalent theory and practice. The former, notwithstanding, was the correct view (concurred in by Abenezra), as Winer almost unnecessarily proves, and Michaelis before him, Suppl. ad lex. s. v. עֶרֶב, comparing the Arabic usage.[2] If this controversy, whether *before* or *after* sun-down was the limit of the day, had been connected also with a diverse *date*, occasion might have been in some sense given for moving the day onward, and thus introducing a division in the Kalendar. But *this* was not the case, else would the priority of the Pharisaic passover have resulted, according to Josephus. We mention this analogy only for the purpose of asking,—Why might not

[1] Which *ἔδει* we thus more definitely justify than Weitzel does in his excellent treatise upon the Passover festival. We cannot bring ourselves to understand, with him, "an Old Testament meal made earlier *by necessity*" (analogous with the deferring it in Num. ix. 11).

[2] Convincing reasons are—The analogy of Ex. xxix. 39, the בְּטֹא הַשֶּׁמֶשׁ, Deut. xvi. 6, the whole history of the exodus immediately after the passover.

the reckoning of the day, through some possible circumstance of which we have no record, have become subject to such a diversity as appears in the Gospels? For as τὸ πάσχα was assuredly not eaten twice, *our sources* say plainly this and no more, that some ate it on one day, and others on the next. And can we not bring our minds to attach at least the same authority to the plain letter of *Scripture* as to that of Josephus or the Talmud? It cannot indeed be *proved* (scilicet, from other sources), nor can it be demanded without disparagement to the γραφή, that such a diversity of practice existed in the time of Jesus; but it is historically imaginable. We have ground enough for this without resorting to the various reckoning of the new moon at a much later time (according to Capellus, Iken, etc.). Suffice it that we may ask, Who can prove it to be impossible that the difference, *which is historically as certain as the authority of at least two Apostles can make it*, should have some such reason? Then should we escape from the hypothesis, which, however slightly regarded, is objectionable, that Jesus was crucified on the great feast day;[1] and with that, much sophistical perversion of St John's expressions. Then Jesus fulfilled (as Scaliger, Casaubon, Marck, etc. assumed) the law exactly, while its observation among the people had fallen into disorder. And then our typological view finds a yet *deeper significance* in the whole arrangement of these events according to the profound counsel of God.

It was impossible, that is, that our Lord's last eating the paschal lamb, as the end of His obedience under the law, should be perfectly simultaneous with His own offering of Himself; an absolute coincidence of type and reality could not be. Yet should this coincidence be as close as possible, especially, at least, where the correspondency was most important, in the connection between the Supper and the paschal lamb. Hence it was provided (as Lampe says, whose *anticipabat*, however, we do not agree with—occulto Dei consilio) that the occurrences should take place just as we find them. Now this was deeply significant in two ways. On the same day on which the majority representing the people, the Pharisaic part, ate their

[1] Compare, in addition, Tholuck's liter. Anzeiger 1847. S. 200, ff.

passover, the Lord is crucified.[1] But they crucify Him first, and then go to eat their passover at the illegally deferred time, and rendered unclean by the blood of the Son of God! That signifies most clearly, The type is now *done away!*[2] But the Lord on His part *glorifies* for His new Israel the *abiding* type by the institution of the Sacrament in connection with His *legally proper* passover; so that *our* sacramental institution took place most harmoniously as an *anticipation* of the great event, just as the first passover of Moses was an anticipation of the exodus, of the actual passing over and redemption.

In addition to the note of time St John gives us here a preparatory remark, which announces with dignity a new scene, predicting in sublime words a sublime event. The public life and teaching of the Lord has reached its close. The hour is come, which had from the beginning been indicated as nearer and nearer. The history of the Passion begins. But with demonstrations and new exhibitions of love to *His own* before He departed from them. And by this expression the Evangelist tells us that the esoteric portion of the Gospel, its most essential mystery, is about to follow: awakening in every feeling heart a deep desire —after all the previous warfare of unbelief against the truth, after all the fruitless striving of the Son of God and the Son of man to win these children of Abraham and sons of Adam to Himself and eternal life, after all this vain pouring forth of His precious ointment, of His wooing bridegroom-love (Cant. i. 3; Jno. iii. 29)—to taste at last and see how *gracious* He is to those who have been made His own, how He comforts and solaces His own heart with them, and imparts in all its fulness to them that which others have despised. If the history of the Passion is

[1] Olshausen: "The typical character of the Passover (1Cor. v. 7), makes the assumption probable, that the Lord died on the same day on which the paschal lamb should have been killed." We would only say instead—*was* killed. This coincidence in general our Lord indicates in Matt. xxvi. 2, as God's counsel. Comp. Thiersch, die Kirche in apost. Zeitalter i. 295.

[2] Exspiraverat jam Paschatis umbratilis terminus, postquam Jesus rite ultimum comederat. Lampe.

generally the Holy of Holies in the new covenant—St John, we would fain say, opens to us the very ark of the covenant in the heart of the incarnate Saviour. Happy thou, dear reader, if the voice of the Spirit *now* crieth to thy spirit—*Come and see!* Dignus es intrare—thou also belongest to those who are *His own!*

St John saw into the heart of Jesus; and he therefore writes vers. 1 and 3 as it were out of that heart, as if Jesus had *told* him what he reveals to us by a twice-repeated εἰδώς. The words stream forth, indeed, down to ver. 5 in one continuous flow, ver. 1 is not complete in itself but announces something more; nevertheless, we do well to construe (according to the old and universal view, which Lücke so well justifies) the first verse as standing by itself, so that its emphasis may fall upon the *loving*. The knowing that His hour was come obviously connects this new continuation of the Gospel with the previous chapter, indeed with all that had preceded as far back as ch. ii. 4.[1] Out of *this world*—is, with allusion to ch. xii. 31, a sorrowful retrospect upon the past contradiction of sinners in it. He goes away, leaves this world as all in death; but He alone goeth *to the Father* by a wonderful μεταβαίνειν. He has ἰδίους in this world to leave behind (ch. xvii. 11), whom He Himself has first chosen and obtained through His own love, as certainly as the Father had given them unto Him. These *He had loved* from the beginning, yea, from eternity, before He came forth from the Father for their sakes; He has shown all patience and fidelity towards their infirmity and sinfulness, He has endured all for them and with them, He has borne even until now *their* unbelief for the sake of the kindled spark of faith and love within them. And what love had been already shown even in this! But now He loveth them εἰς τέλος. This is not, with Grotius, to be resolved into—διετέλει ἀγαπῶν, perrexit diligere; nor with Euthymius, τὸ εἰς τέλος τὸ σφόδρα δηλοῖ; nor to be taken as a mere לְנֶצַח (according to the Sept. translation of this, and as the Pesh. Lu. xviii. 5 has בְּכָל עִדָּן); but τέλος is literally His end and departure,

[1] It would be a profitable, and far from exhausted, task, to exhibit the simple art of the plan of this Gospel, as shown in the circumstance that the beginning everywhere prepares for the end, and the end returns back in its fulfilment to the intimations of the beginning.

which now from this meal onwards so long and slowly protracts itself in proofs and tokens of love. Laus in amore mori—a heathen maxim which finds here its highest illustration.[1]

Ver. 2 begins again with an intenser εἰδώς, which now, in contrast with the action which is to commence, becomes equivalent to καίπερ εἰδώς. But another impressive parenthesis intervenes, another καίπερ from an external cause. Even among *His own*, and at this meal, is the traitor found, into whose heart the devil has been able to infuse thoughts of hell! The ἤδη intimates that the design of this parenthesis is further to say, that the destiny of our Lord, to be now delivered into the hands of His enemies, was fully decided and at hand:—yet this is not its only meaning. The Berlenb. Bible comments upon it with deep feeling in its own way: "Something now comes between! The devil has not kept holiday, and the Evangelists always place God's work and Satan's in conjunction, as they are developed together. On both sides preparation is made for the contest: Christ prepares Himself, Satan prepares himself too. Hence the text appears here abruptly torn asunder—yet there is a deep harmony and connection in the matter itself. The style is thus intersected, to show that Christ has such a tangled way to pierce through, and that His disciples must in like manner follow Him." Thus it is not, as Hofmann thinks, a "verbally infelicitous connection of clauses."

Jesus *knew*—it is not now said, what was in the heart of Judas—that follows in ver. 11. Instead of that, without interruption He *knew* that to Him—*not* indeed all, but, nevertheless, even for judgment upon the υἱοὺς τῆς ἀπωλείας, *all things* were given into His hand; and that He was going to God, even *as* He came forth from God, that is, as the Son *to the Father*. Perfect repose, the untroubled consciousness of His might, victory, and glorification fills His spirit now, after His deep amazement. For *Him*, in the place of that *faith* from which in our case *love* springs, we have here *knowledge*. What would one who first read the Gospel *expect*, after such a preface, and after all the previous testimonies to the dignity and glory of this Jesus? The ἠγάπησεν has already given a hint; but no man could have expected what now follows. The first reader must stand amazed,

[1] Nitzsch has a beautiful sermon on "Love to the end."

even like these disciples when He began the work of love and humility. He who does not for ever lose his thoughts in the contemplation of the inconceivable contrast between vers. 3 and 4, is beyond the reach of all exegesis; the most touching exposition to him must be vain and dead. He, the Lord over all, come forth from God and returning to God, concerning whom the greatest of the prophets cried, I am not worthy to *begin* my service to Him by unloosing His shoe's latchet (ch. i. 27)—He goes beyond this; He washes the feet of His disciples, and Judas' among them. For He also knoweth *wherefore* He had come, and *to what end* He goeth again by death, that is, that He might *wash* us. This *they* knew not yet; but they knew it afterwards, and in addition to this most general signification of His act, there is another which has reference to this critical time, their preparation for the last supper. The second preparation comes after in the awakening of the question, *Lord is it I?* through the indication of the betrayer; but the first had already said, *I am He* that cleanseth you! It was not so much on account of their murmuring at the anointing, and their fellowship in sympathy with the traitor, that they now needed this specific cleansing: if any is sought, it may be found in the recent contention recorded by St Luke. But all was fore-arranged, that the Lord, out of the love of His full heart, might speak to them in act before He spoke to them in words, and thus prepare them to take the deepest impression from His words.

The *washing of the feet* was assuredly not simply the lowest *menial service*, but, according to common human analogy, was at the same time no other than a *service of honour and of love* which the host might render to his guests. Ebrard, however, presses this much too far when he declares this to have been the customary "duty of the host," so that "the Lord may be said in the deep significance of this act to have already invited His *guests* to *His* supper." For even Lu. vii. 44 does not say expressly that the washing was to be expected from the host, but is rather to be interpreted by Gen. xviii. 4; and in Lu. xxii. 27, the Lord expressly indicates the main point to be—ὡς ὁ διακονῶν.[1]

[1] We very much doubt whether (as Lange thinks) this feet-washing arose from the *necessity* of the moment, being a necessary service which none of the disciples volunteered to perform.

Unusual, and pointing to a striking significance, is the rising up from the meal already proceeding. The Evangelist paints the circumstance with a living remembrance of the amazement which seized at the time both him and the rest of the disciples:—hence the interchange of the present tense, and hence that most emphatic ἤρξατο, for which nothing that preceded had prepared them. Everything pertaining to the act He did Himself; down to the wiping He finishes all in the case of each of the disciples, in whom He beholds all *His own* down to the end of time. In solemn stillness and with the deepest reverence they first allow Him to proceed—until it comes to Peter. For that Peter was not the first,[1] is plain from the previous fifth verse, especially from the *wiping*—else we must resort to such an anticipation as is quite out of harmony with the living presentation of the whole narrative.[2] If supposition were allowable where the Holy Ghost records nothing—for all gradation of rank *here* passes away—it would be more probable that *Judas* was the first (as Chrys. and Theoph., with many following them, thought); though if *Peter* were the last, his refusal would be scarcely conceivable.[3]

That which probably others thought before him, he speaks out plainly, and without any restraint. His meaning is not wrong, but here once more it befalls him to savour not the things of God but the things of man. Through false and self-willed reverence and voluntary humility he sinks into opposition and refusal; for most assuredly *his* thought does not now apprehend the true Divine humility. The customary κύριε comes first as we see, but it has here a distinctive emphasis; but the intensest emphasis lies in the contrast which is pressed to the uttermost

[1] Although Nonnus takes this for granted; and since Augustin many have so thought. Bellarmin founds a strong argument upon it, and Klee maintains that every other disciple would have similarly declined. Baum.-Crusius: ἔρχεται, probably at the commencement! So Grotius, without any reason: οὖν hic est specialius rem enarrantis.

[2] Which Luthardt, however, agrees with, arguing that it was a preparatory description of the whole act which would render Peter's conduct intelligible! But what simple writer would relate in this style?

[3] Dräseke thinks, first John, then immediately Peter. Richter, though without any reason, Either first or last was the washing of Peter. Schleiermacher says with great discrimination, The ordinary pre-eminence of Peter was the reason why the Lord *this time* took occasion *not* to begin with him.

σύ—μοῦ! Not till these words have uttered his deep feeling does he finish the sentence, which, however, still strongly protests: by the present νίπτεις he rises up against the commencing action of the Lord Himself; τοὺς πόδας comes in last to heighten the whole; and the interrogation is not simply such but a most absolute refusal, although a slight but true feeling of genuine awe prevents him in his first words from doing more than *question*, until ver. 8 comes in with a different tone. Thus his present word is fundamentally the same with that affrighted utterance which responded to the approaching love of the Saviour in Lu. v. 8. This colloquy between him and his Lord is by no means, as B.-Crusius unfeelingly and foolishly says, "a trifling matter," nor is it a subordinate circumstance which St John might well have omitted; but Peter is here, if we would see the great meaning of the whole, a type of man generally, as he revolts against the eternal love which offers itself in the redeeming death of Christ. "For thy sake, O sinner, I have laid by the garment of My glory, have girded Myself with the napkin of the flesh, to pour out My blood as a cleansing bath for thee—*as thy God and thy Servant!*" But, alas, in man's refusal, This is unworthy of God, this *cannot be*—there too often lies the still worse undertone (from which Peter, however, according to ver. 9, was utterly free)—*Nor is this at all needful!*

Ver. 7. And now, but not until it is constrained from Him, comes the first *word* of our Lord after His silent act; but it contains the assurance that He had designed *afterwards* to speak and explain all. And He gives prominence to the contrasted ἐγώ and σύ, but in their right meaning, and with the true inference:—I am the Master, Thou the disciple—How shouldst thou then at once know, penetrate, and understand *what* I do, that is, what I thereby purpose and mean? Obedience without argument would be the profounder modesty. And the trusting disciple of such a Master, teaching as Jesus did both by act and word, might and ought to have *expected* that He would explain all in condescension to His disciple's weakness. The meek and gentle Lord, however, does not by the slightest word rebuke the impatience of Peter, who would not thus wait; the single οὐκ οἶδας ἄρτι was sufficient rebuke, and at the same time utters a

promise to supply that deficiency of knowledge which is thereby rather excused. The antithesis between ἄρτι and μετὰ ταῦτα shows that the most obvious meaning must be referred to the repelled washing:—As soon as I have done it unto all, thou shalt know with the rest what My act signifies. And truly, without the words which now accompany, and afterwards follow, the act, we should none of us understand the meaning of what He did; we might discern in it the *example* of humility, but scarcely the manifold mystery of the profound *symbol.* For wide and deep is this mystery; and therefore the Saviour begins the preliminary solution of it by a word which, as the commencement of that solution, has a universal import. *What I do*—first, this washing of your feet; then (as follows in ver. 8) the washing generally thereby denoted; finally, all His work in us, in as far as it centres in and belongs to this, that He washes us from sin. Who understood the work of His *atoning passion* when and while it was accomplished? And how wide does this μετὰ ταῦτα reach for His church and the world, in which the counsels of God in the humiliation of Christ are from age to age ever becoming more profoundly and fully disclosed! So also the last application of this word, that by which the Holy Ghost so often uses it for humbling our resistance and consoling our apprehensions, is perfectly well-grounded. It is in its widest extent an utterance concerning *all* the acts of God, which will never be fully understood till hereafter; the eternal Majesty speaks in this lowest abasement of the Son, and speaks with reference to all the future acts of His government from this present action onwards. It is enough for us that He shows us and gives us to feel no more than this—I do it; we may confidently resign ourselves to His hand. We shall hereafter know, that and in what way all was done for our purification; we shall in eternity look back upon the whole process of His guiding and cleansing our souls, and merge all in that cry—Thou hast washed us from our sins, and therefore didst Thou obediently abase Thyself to our feet!

Ver. 8. The first word was thus distinct and gentle, thus serenely victorious over the impetuosity of Peter; yet it is with this disciple as often with us all, his outbursting zeal renders him incapable of hearing, much more of understanding and

receiving the first words with which the Lord opposes him. They urge, rather, his opposition to a further extreme; he will maintain his right, accept no *οὐκ οἶδας*, and be referred to no *γνώσῃ μετὰ ταῦτα*. Though the other washed disciples had improperly allowed the Lord thus to act, he will show himself wiser and more humble than they, as if he knew even better than his Master what was befitting and right! The present *νίπτεις* and the tone of question betrayed before something tending to submission; but now he begins with an imperative *οὐ μὴ νίψῃς*, and confirms it with the deepest feeling by *εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα*. (Bengel: formula vehemens, cf. 1 Cor. viii. 13.) What other can the gracious Lord do now, than oppose vehemence to vehemence, and utter a second, decisive and heart-piercing word which should *affright* the contradicter, who nevertheless in the ground of his heart hangs upon Him and would be His? If I shall *wash* thee not, *thou hast no part with* (*or*, *in*) *Me!* Alas, such words of threatening and fear are too often necessary for us all, to induce us to permit ourselves to be loved. It is wrong to say, as many do with good intention but a narrow interpretation, that the threatening here is not to be sought in the word washing, or in the transaction connected with it; for this *νίπτειν* is the kernel and object of the whole. Thus it is not, "Unless thou bend to My ordinance, and give up thy disobedient independence of My will"—this would be too naked a generality! Nor, as Lücke says, "He who will not tolerate, or does not understand, the humility of love, as now exemplified in Me." Nor, as another says, approaching somewhat nearer, "Unless thou, by acceptance of this service, showest thyself to be willing to perform such!" Neither of these hits the point of significance; the latter passes beyond it into the *final* interpretation of ver. 14. He who *does not comprehend* the humble love with which Jesus washes him, understands it not simply because he does not know and consider *what* this *washing* essentially is. De Wette and Lücke quite falsely urge that the real gist of the matter is not the cleansing but the humility of love: this saying in ver. 8, and the general declaration of ver. 10, sufficiently refute them. The *washing* is not specifically a "purification from all petty loftiness of spirit"—as Dräseke says. Let us look at its deep fulness of meaning, as the Lord Himself exhi-

bits it under three aspects: the feet-washing signifies, first, that it is the Lord who *cleanses* us, He alone can and will wash us; it then points further to the continual necessity that those who have been cleansed in the bath should ever wash their *feet*, and that this likewise must come from His patience and love; while, thirdly, and resting upon these (though it is too often regarded as the sole point, the previous foundation being forgotten), that we also can and should be helpful *to one another* in all humble services which might contribute to that end.[1]

That the Lord on this occasion does not mean this external washing, but that which it signifies, is clear from the threatening itself, and from the fact that He washed Judas also, who nevertheless had no part in Him.[2] That, further, He did not now as yet speak particularly of a spiritual washing of the feet, the continuous cleansing from remaining or again adhering sins, is equally clear from this that He now—and let it be carefully noted!—does *not* speak of the *feet*, as Peter does twice, but extends the matter to its utmost generality, and penetrates its deepest ground—*I must wash thee!* This His utterance here is essentially similar, though with other words, to that of ch. vi. 53. And it is for emphasis and awakening that He does not say at first *from what* the washing is; for His single word would ask—Dost thou not then at all perceive and understand what is now concerned between Me and thee, Me the sole Helper and Purifier *from sin*, and thee the "sinful man!" Dost thou not remember the time when thou didst bid Me depart from thee? Hast thou not since learned in My school to what all things point *which I do?* If the former part of the sentence, with its simple and impressive "wash thee," was not penetrating enough,

[1] Hence, that view is most superficial, and forgets the *ground* here laid for the whole, which regards the Lord's design as being simply to deepen their humility and *take away all their previous ideas of a worldly kingdom.* Dräseke: "He will make a last essay. He would burn out of the hearts of His messengers the dross of earth still in them." Bahrdt, in the same direction: "Nothing cleaves to you but the prejudice of a temporal Messiah; it is merely a washing of feet that ye need. Your Lord now shows Himself a servant, that you may remember that ye are called to be servants of humanity, not Princes of the East!"

[2] Luthardt: "If thou dost not bethink thyself what My washing signifies."

the fearful sequel makes all plain—Then are we severed for ever! Yes, verily, this was a terrifying and awakening word, for it meant, Then dost thou remain *unwashed*, as thou art, impure, without forgiveness and without grace, without salvation and without a Saviour, unfit for and unworthy of My fellowship here, and hereafter of My kingdom and My glory. For to intimate this last the *μετ' ἐμοῦ* is used, although the *ἐν ἐμοί* is obviously included in it. *Or wilt thou wash thyself?*—At the same time the Lord gives it here to be understood—I wash no man against his will. And let this be deeply pondered!

The passionate desire to have a part in and with Jesus, would now break down all the self-will of this disciple, even without his definitely understanding the connection between this washing and that blessedness; but we may safely assume more than that, and regard Peter as *now beginning to understand.* We cannot imagine him to be slow to apprehend the Lord's plain words, or to be utterly unable to perceive the Lord's wonted and sudden transition to a figurative meaning in all this. We cannot, therefore, agree with Braune's remark upon Peter's submission, "Right characteristic is this perfect change, with the same *externality!*" For how can it be proved that Peter tarried in the external meaning? To us, this would be less characteristic than unpsychological. We agree with Bengel, Petro sensus impuritatis propriæ obortus hæc verba dictavit: with Tholuck, "His consciousness of sin was awakened by these words:" with Baum.-Crusius, "The words of Peter enter into the impersonal and universal meaning of the Lord's words." Thus alone can we understand, in a sense worthy of the Apostle, the instant retractation of his *οὐ μὴ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα,* the impetuous going beyond of the offer of his hands and his head. This last is very generally taken as a running to the other extreme, instead of adhering to the simple will of Christ—that the feet should be washed. Although there may be some slight trace of this spirit perceptible, and although our Lord does actually in ver. 10 limit him once more to the washing of the *feet*, yet it must be remembered that in ver. 8 He had spoken only of washing generally, and that the unusual expression *head* (instead of face) will not suit the idea of a merely external sense. We understand the blessed Peter:—Yea, if Thou meanest it thus, if this

washing is thus connected with that washing of Thine which we all need and none so much as I; then take me, *the whole Simon*, I am indeed unclean from my *head* to my feet![1] Thus we find the expression most natural, entering into the Lord's spiritual meaning and yet rightly adhering to His figurative present action; and we have no more to do than add the edifying consideration for the preacher—that head and hands are not enough, the *heart* must be washed!

Ver. 10. Peter showed by the quickly understanding word which he spoke even in the midst of his false zeal, that he was already in his essential heart a λελουμένος; and therefore the Lord can proceed further to expound the more specific meaning of the washing of the feet. The distinction and contrast which He makes between a bath which perfectly washes the whole body, and the washing of the feet which is only subsidiarily needful, is founded upon custom, propriety, and ordinary language; but it is here made the symbol of a most important truth in relation to fellowship with Christ. As we have seen, the Lord's word in ver. 8 passed over into the more general signification, while yet, not to break off the connection altogether, the expression νίπτειν used for partial washings remained; hence, Peter also, with all his earnestness of desire to yield himself up to a total washing, can mention only individual members. The Lord now corrects the incongruity of the well-meant expression, and attributes to the disciples collectively, with the exception of one, an already existing purity in the main; while He thus most graciously restrains within bounds the excess in the desire of their representative Peter. Hence, and for that reason the evidently antithetic λελουμένος, which does not refer to the hands and the face (for of these also νίψασθαι and νίπτειν are used), but, as the ὅλος distinctly shows, to a proper bath. Our common version, therefore, needs correction here—Wer *gebadet* ist.[2] It was, generally speaking, customary before meals, espe-

[1] As Nonnus paraphrases, ναὶ πάλιν, ἢν ἐθέλῃς; καὶ ὅλον δέμας.

[2] Lange protests against this, because the theocracy knew nothing of baths, only of washings and baptisms. We would not quarrel about the expression, but is it not here actually twofold, and as such to be reproduced? Is not the washing of the *whole body* (Heb. x. 22: comp. 2 Peter ii. 22), to be called a *bath?* Is not that our very word for the λουτρὸν of *baptism?*

cially for guests at a feast, to enter the bath; and this is enough for the mere truthfulness of the figure. Meanwhile, we doubt very much whether the disciples had done so on this occasion; for this was a species of luxury for the more distinguished, certainly was no rule in the simple life of Jesus with His Galilæans, at least we find no instance of such a preparation for a feast or a visit.[1] Assuredly, it might have been so at this time, just before the passover; but to our mind the word of Jesus is more emphatic and more clear, if we suppose this not to have been the case. For then, the *transition from the figure to the thing signified*, which the Lord, as every one must admit, now plainly makes, becomes more impressive and forcible.

Our λοῦσθαι (of which this of the disciples was only a *typical* beginning), is the laver of regeneration and renewing, in which we are perfectly washed at the commencement from all our former sins and defilements (1 Cor. vi. 11); and this principle of all further holiness, concurrent with our forgiveness, is an actual purification of the heart, of the whole inner man, through the Holy Ghost received by faith. (Acts xv. 8, 9.) He who remains faithful to this privilege, and does not again return to wallow in the mire (2 Pet. ii. 22), from which he had been delivered, needs not a second time this same universal washing; but he *does need* an incessantly repeated washing of the *feet;* with which he must walk upon or in the mire.[2] This is that continuous daily repentance in which we diligently aim to purify ourselves, that is, at the same time, to suffer ourselves to be purified, from all still adhering or new contracted filthiness of the flesh and spirit (2 Cor. vii. 1)—πᾶσα ῥυπαρία καὶ περισσεία κακίας, Jas. i. 21. This relation may in some sense be referred to *baptism* and the *Lord's supper*, inasmuch as the latter perpetually requires, as the confirmation and seal of our ἔχειν μέρος μετὰ τοῦ κυρίου, a perpetual repentance and believing acknowledgment of our sins. The *feet* signify, generally, the flesh, which still connects us with the earth, and through which we are ever susceptible of sin, even while the head may look towards

[1] Hence Dräseke is somewhat too confident: "they prepared themselves for every festival feast, at least, by a bath." So Lange makes this *necessary* preparation by a bath an argument that this was a passover meal.

[2] Nonnus: εἰ μὴ μοῦνα πόδεσσι καθάρσια νίπτρα πορείης εἰνοδίης.

heaven, the heart be heavenly-minded, and the hands by which we perform our Christian duty be to the utmost of our knowledge and will undefiled. We may, therefore, regard the spiritual feet-washing (with Meyer elsewhere), as "*the lower nature* in its subjection to the constant necessity of a renewal unto holiness." Yet, inasmuch as with the feet we must walk in duty, and walking and working are in their real meaning one and the same, and the feet must stand and walk uprightly in order to the integrity of the work of our hands, what is said of them must hold good also of the hands: hence, David Ps. xxiv. 6, and Asaph Ps. lxxiii. 13, wash their hands in the perpetual service of God, comp. Jas. iv. 8, 1 Tim. ii. 8; hence, also, in the typical ordinances of the priests, Ex. xxx. 18, 19, both hands and feet are so referred to. The feet are named particularly here, because they would most appropriately suit the application to that condescending performance of such purifying service to others, which the Lord purposed to dwell upon afterwards. "It is a muddy world through which we all have to pass," as one says; and the rule, Touch not the unclean thing! has many exceptions in the case of the pure through the claims of their duty. It is not always without hurt to ourselves that we discharge these duties, such is the infirmity of our flesh, and such the never-resting desire of the tempter to injure us. "The devil lets no saint reach heaven with clean feet." (Luther.) And it is of the utmost importance that we never learn lightly to esteem this ever necessary cleansing. On the one hand, the consciousness that we have been once washed throughout and made clean should not be extinguished into despondency; and, on the other, we should ever remember, for our security against false confidence, that our feet *need* washing. He who neglects this, and is not ready, when the Lord comes, to accept His cleansing, is in great danger of falling again into a state in which he will have no part in Him:—and so the ἐὰν μὴ νίψω σε has its appropriate place of warning in the middle. And even this feet-washing is an actual washing, which can be effected, as in the first λουτρὸν παλιγγενεσίας, only by the spirit and grace of God; the slightest particle of dust that adheres to us cannot be washed away by ourselves. Zinzendorf's meaning is quite good when he says, "*As soon as* the heart prays for the

feet, they are washed"—but this expression betrays some slight tendency to antinomian security, and to the placing of justification in the stead of holiness, whereas it should ever be unto holiness. More proper would it be to say, As soon as the heart prays to the Lord to wash the feet, they are washed *by Him.*

If any one of the disciples was dull enough of apprehension, though this is scarce supposable, to have hitherto misunderstood the Lord, His last saying is distinct and decisive as to the spiritual meaning of His words:—Ye are clean (as ch. xv. 3, to which we must refer for the exposition of this word)—*but not all!*[1] There is *one among you* (ch. vi. 70) whom I have externally washed (hardly—whom I will now wash)—but that avails him nothing. Let it be carefully observed, that, on the one hand, the Lord does not in His gentleness point out the traitor for general opprobrium; and, on the other, how earnestly He makes him the basis of an indefinite general warning. This warning should resound in the midst of the narrowest circle of disciples.

Vers. 12–15. *Their* feet, that is, the disciples', ver. 5, therefore the feet of all. The ὅτε οὖν ἔνιψεν here intermediate tells us plainly that Peter was not the last of all, and that the Lord after the colloquy with him (in which the completed act was presupposed), continued with the remainder who also *needed* it. The work is now done, and now follows the promised information, so far as the anticipation of it which Peter had occasioned rendered it necessary. The *first* point in the explanation is this: —*I alone* can and I will wash you, as in that universal washing so also in the future incessant washing of your feet. Let not this be overlooked! But it has been already said, and the Lord hastens to its *second* meaning:—Ye also must act in like manner one towards another, at least in washing one another's feet, so far as by My help ye may be mutually serviceable to that end. The *question* coming first points back to the *first* meaning; but includes the other now first to be opened up. Do ye know, do ye now well understand, according to My words to Peter and you all (ye are clean), what I designed to intimate and promise, that I have washed and would wash you? The question as it

[1] Thus much is true; but it is altogether incorrect to say, with Dräseke, "So far, until now, the Lord's words had reference to the body."

regards this first meaning the Lord tacitly answers for them with Yes; but he goes further at once, without waiting to hear it, with a new answer:—Ye do not, nevertheless, know its full meaning, and I will now tell you all.[1] Not the less, however, is His general question a great and comprehensive word for all who should ever call Him Master and Lord, and themselves His disciples; for in these last discourses, especially, the most specific meaning, as connected with the local event, is blended and combined with the most universal. The great question may be applied to the thing which was here signified, as well as to the symbolical action itself which set it forth. From the cross of propitiation He puts to all professing Christians, and to all who are truly His own, the piercing question, Know ye what I have done unto you? (Forasmuch as ye *know!* 1 Pet. i. 18.) Alas, too many of them know it not; and therefore they know not, like those who crucified, what *they* do by their continuance in sin. Moreover, to baptism and the supper of the Lord, and every other ordinance of the church which symbolizes the grace of Christ, we may apply the question,—Will ye not come by experience to know the reality of this mystery, that I may do to you internally, what I have already *done* by way of promise and pledge in external ordinances?

Φωνεῖν might signify invocation or address, and then *ὁ διδάσκαλος καὶ ὁ κύριος* would be in the vocative, as indeed they might; but we prefer with Winer, and many in past times, to take *φωνεῖν* for *nominare*, call. This seems to us more natural, and more conformable to the *καλῶς λέγετε*. When ye speak of Me, ye say—The Master, the Lord. We may compare not only Matt. xxiii. 8 for the one, as Matt. vii. 21 for the other; but also Matt. xxvi. 18, John xi. 28 with Matt. xxi. 3, as the transition to Luke xxiv. 34; John xx. 25, xxi. 7. The Master is *believed*, the Lord is *obeyed*. He meekly assumes the simple "Master," adding to it the "Lord," which latter then again, we observe, significantly comes first in ver. 14. Jesus to us is both,

[1] Thus we interpret the Lord's meaning differently from many, Dräseke to wit, who passes over the first most plainly expressed meaning—I must wash you! but takes for granted the second—So must ye also one another! as obvious to all. "The Lord's meaning was clear as day, even before He explained it. But He gave *words* to the general feeling of all."

as He cannot but testify even here, in this work of His profound humility, in order that that work may be understood; indeed, He cannot yet disclose all to these disciples, because the pre-typified work of redemption was not yet accomplished—but *we*, as they did afterwards, know more; we call Him *Saviour* and *Redeemer*, including this in our κύριος. And now, though most unexpectedly to the disciples, the commandment is urged, as in imitation of *His work*—καὶ ὑμεῖς ὀφείλετε. If I, your Lord and Master, did not in My humility and love count it too vile a thing to wash your feet—how can ye refrain from doing the same, when and as far as ye may do like Me as My disciples? It has been said that the Lord in His condescension does not intimate the great disparity, but places Himself on a level with His disciples: this, however, is not true, for the contrast comes out with double force in ὀφείλετε and ἀλλήλων. Grotius: multo magis vos, qui *conservi* estis, debetis. Ver. 15, finally, turns into the general statement, that *all* Christ's acts are for an example to His followers, comp. 1 Pet. ii. 21. It is also true, as we shall see, that the mutual feet-washing embraces in reality the whole *collective* duties of Christian charity among Christ's disciples; ὑπόδειγμα, too, must retain its *most specific* reference, inasmuch as it here indicates (as elsewhere something typical, figurative) a *symbolical action.*

Are we then literally and externally to wash one another's feet? Assuredly, in case that ever becomes a needful service of love—and other still more menial and repulsive services are we to perform. But the proper meaning of our Lord's commandment, taken in the light of all His explanation, is not this external one: hence, He does not say, *what* I have done, but, *as* I have done. Böhmer's strange attempt to vindicate for the washing of the feet a "sacramental dignity" (Stud. u. Krit. 1850, 4)—needs no refutation. But Herder's zeal goes improperly to the other extreme:—"To repeat this symbolical act of feet-washing, in spite of all objections of climate and usage, would be a mere presumptuous aping of holy actions." This is to look with unjustifiable contempt upon those sincere and childlike men who have felt it right to confirm and strengthen themselves in the performance of the thing signified by performing also the symbolical act itself; and of *these* we cannot say, that they have

"petrified into a dry ceremonial what was intended to teach the spirit which should animate our whole life." (Dräseke.) The traces of such a custom in the early church, though as late as the fourth century, are to be found collected in Bingham, iv. 394; Luther did not disapprove of it, if performed in simplicity and from a good nature; the Moravian Brethren have their Pedilavium at the present time, though they discreetly leave it without any compulsory enactment. It is, however, an important circumstance, as warning against the desecration of a holy thing by lack of simplicity and purity in ourselves, that we find nothing in the New Testament account of the apostolical age of any symbolical feet-washing. In 1 Tim. v. 10, the whole matter is placed in its right position: in cases of necessity, the thing itself is to be done, but it is the type of lower services of charity in general.[1] As it regards the caricatures of this sacred duty which appears in the vain ceremonial of some churches, they condemn themselves to every open eye; and Bengel's sarcasm, so often quoted, may be ever applied to them:—"It would be more to be admired if, for instance, the Pope were *in serious humility* to wash the feet of one king, instead of the feet of twelve paupers."[2]

In its deepest and most general sense our Lord's commandment to wash one another's feet, as He himself had done, is the same new one commandment—to love one another as He had loved us, vers. 34, 35. Love is humility, love delights to serve the necessities as well of body as of soul: here we have the twofold signification of the feet-washing, the former, however, being itself only a figure of the second, which essentially is the sole meaning. First, and in general, we should, in the most internal humility, after the pattern of our Lord's humility, never be too lofty or too prudent to perform acts of service to our neighbour. And then, secondly, we should as brothers in Christ be affectionately and mutually helpful in cleansing one another from the sins which still adhere to us, and *to that end* be ever humbly disposed to stoop down to our brother's soiled feet. External services of love may admit of comparison with this washing of the

[1] For this second meaning is, to our mind, the undertone of the text.

[2] Richter's Hausbibel, again:—Many are rather disposed to wash one another's heads than one another's feet.

feet; they may, indeed, be more menial and difficult than that, although, after all, they cannot reach the depth of condescension in our *Lord and Master's* washing His disciples' feet. In Lu. x. 34, 37, we have such a work of mercy, as a ὑπόδειγμα for all doing *likewise.*[1] Every disciple should be rejoiced to take the place of a *servant* to the servants of *his Lord;* in the spirit of those words of Abigail in the presence of David, 1 Sam. xxv. 41. Where there is necessity, love does the work in person, and is not satisfied always with laying out its twopence for the sick and the poor. It fulfils with readiness *difficult, unwonted, despised, yea, even loathsome* offices—as Dräseke expresses himself, preaching against effeminacy and backwardness to the hard duties of religion. But the proper spiritual work of washing the feet in our Saviour's meaning, is expressed in Gal. vi. 1, 2. It is already taken for granted that we have *forgiven* our brother if his fault was a trespass against ourselves; but we are also bound, as brethren in common, to apply ourselves to his defilement, if by any means we may help him to regain his purity through the grace of Christ. And here comes into specific application our Lord's fundamental principle, Mark ix. 35. Here must we lay aside our titles of "Lord and Master," even as He did His, and by doing so approved Himself to be, and became, their Lord and Master; the more we are able to serve and help, the higher will be our position and character in Christ. We must go beyond the quiet and secret enjoyment of our own grace, gird ourselves with the towel of Christ, and take from Him constantly the true water of the purifying Spirit, first for our own hands and feet, that we may be able spiritually to approach our brother, and come to him as the true *messengers and ministers* of Him who alone doeth all things by us. Nor must we ever forget the consolatory *wiping*, which completes the act! To such conduct towards others are we called and sent as purified ourselves, in such mutual dealing do we ourselves become perfectly clean. Another doeth this for me in return, if I need it—this I should ever bear in mind, and to this the ἀλλήλων significantly points. Here becomes that λόγος an ἀληθινός (ch. iv. 37)—one hand

[3] Luthardt should have read all that I have here said, expressly denying the limitation of the feet-washing to such "external offices of love," before he attributed to me such narrow views.

washes the other. Therefore thou shouldst suffer thyself also to be washed of the Lord *through* His disciples. Whoso refuses this is thus condemned by Rieger: "Christ was in this case too high for Peter, and His servants are too low for you!" Are we in the highest sense *ministers* of the Lord, ἀπόστολοι pre-eminently,—then let us especially wash each other's feet, as every man his own before the Lord! Luther says rightly, "Thus this example of washing the feet has a special reference to such as hold office in the church;" but we must not, with Lampe, restrict the whole precept, as well as ver. 10 itself, to the Apostles, whose *feet* in the bringing good tidings in an evil world need washing.[1]

Vers. 16, 17. What the Lord had already said, Matt. x. 24; Lu. vi. 40, and repeats with another application, Jno. xv. 20, has here obviously (see, however, ver. 18) the simple, proverbially striking, meaning that the servant and messenger should not deem himself too high to perform any service which his Lord who sent him had previously performed. Thus is struck down every lofty feeling which would say, Should I abase myself so low as to wash the feet of such an one? That would not be becoming in me! And for this the Lord substitutes, Should I be lofty enough to dare to refuse such a service? Would *that* be becoming in me? The special title—ἀπόστολος (Lu. vi. 13)—which here alone occurs in St John, is designedly carried back to its general meaning, and made parallel with δοῦλος;—and what other title of honour can assume anything beyond this first and most distinctive title in the kingdom of God? The ταῦτα and αὐτά combines this last enforcement of the humble mind with the previous requirement of the work of humility; and thus the clear and most impressive precept points to a universal *internal and external* "doing" thereafter. For a mere external doing the Lord never admits. There is too often a great gulf fixed—not only between the

[1] For this he quotes Apollinarius and Heracleota from the Catena: Pedum hæc lotio quid arcanum hic insinuat, quale v. gr. vide baturesse præparatio pedum Apostolicorum ad opus Apostolicum. Mundatis siquidem illos pedibus mittit, concessâ iis puritate conspicuos, ut sic orbem terrarum peragrare possent, salutis nuntia promulgantes, luxta quod legitur: Quam speciosi pedes evangelizantium pacem.

knowing what we should do and the actual performance of it —but also between the *knowing* that we are not greater than our Lord and the actual conduct of our heart in humility. Alas, for an unblessed mere solitary knowledge! *Woe* unto them who knew their Master's will and neither prepared themselves inwardly, nor did according to His will outwardly! Lu. xii. 48. Who, indeed, is capable of doing this, even with the word and the symbol before him? The symbol must first itself be experienced, the Lord must first wash us and continually wash us:—then only do we know what He hath done to us; and then does the pardoned and purified spirit feel the full force of the obligation to do likewise unto all as Christ has done to him. On the other hand, nevertheless, the mere knowledge of what He said serves, inasmuch as the grace to experience it was therein offered, to condemn us in a twofold sense if we do not by experience and practice press forward to a living knowledge in that higher sense of which St Bernard speaks; Tantum scimus, quantum operamur. Similarly Dräseke, who admirably refers to the future *practical knowledge* of the Apostles, in which they learned more and more profoundly to understand the words—Thou shalt *know* hereafter!

Ver. 18. The three yet remaining verses stand, as B.-Crusius thinks, "affectingly detached, in broken sentences;" yet have they a very close connection, even including the last. The Lord returns back in sorrow, having been viewing His *Apostles* as a whole, to that saying—*But not all!* To the unhappy Judas, although he calls Him Master and is numbered among His Apostles, He cannot say μακάριος εἶ, because not even the first knowledge is his, which is here ascribed to all the rest; and He must now in connection with this λέγειν except him once more. But He now adds most plainly that there is only one who must thus be excluded, referring plainly by the ἐξελεξάμην to ch. vi. 70. On account of the similarity in the expression, many insist, with Euthym., Maldonatus, Grot., B.-Crusius, and Alford, that the Lord here also still includes Judas—"I know who ye all are whom I have chosen." But we think, with others, that the election here, as in ch. xv. 16, has reference merely to the faithful, and find in it the distinction referred to in ch. vi. between a first and a second election.

Judas has *already* (ver. 2) failed to make his calling and election sure: he has *undone* it. Amid the grief with which this pierces His soul (see presently ver. 21), the Lord consoles Himself with the foreseeing and permissive *counsel of God* which the *Scripture* foreannounces. *Ἀλλ' ἵνα* must be complemented by a simple *τοῦτο γέγονε* (as Matt. xxvi. 56); and by no means, as B.-Crusius explains it,—*ἐξελεξάμην ὑμᾶς*, it was necessary that ye should thus have been chosen, not every one honest and pure! For this thought would border on the error that Judas was appointed to his specific sin, and not that his sin was an event of his own free determination which was foreseen.

Concerning the interpretation of Ps. xli. as a prophecy of Christ, we must refer to the details in our commentary, where we have shown that this entire psalm, which rests upon David's own typical experiences, treats actually from ver. 5 downwards of Christ, the דָּל or עָנִי *κατ' ἐξοχὴν*, whom all should consider attentively (ver. 1); but in such a manner that the experiences of His members and followers are combined with those of their Head and Forerunner. This harmonises with the connection between vers. 16 and 20; and shows that ver. 16 already points forward to the same meaning as afterwards in ch. xv. 20. And that deep meaning is,—It is for you to act in love and humility as I have done, although you may have to do with many a Judas, whose feet ye wash in vain; for ye are not above your Master. For this let your hearts be prepared! Hence, it is not as many say, who would vindicate the meaning of this application—Christ makes all the sufferings of all His saints; but conversely—All the followers as well as all the types of Christ make His experience. *This* is the key to the psalm, which opens it to us as a typical psalm in the true meaning of the word, so that in the mind of the prophetic Spirit Christ Himself (with His people) is actually signified in it. Hence it is as necessary as it is remarkable, that in the quotation the אֲשֶׁר בָּטַחְתִּי בוֹ—which could not be true of Jesus Himself—is omitted: for those other words must be substituted—I know whom I have chosen! On the other hand, the eating bread (in the original *His* bread) derives a fearful meaning from the participation in the sacramental supper; a meaning which must be applied for ever to all unworthy communicants, as well as to

all betrayers of Christ who eat the bread of His Church.[1] Moreover, the whole passage, because it is not a literal and exclusive Messianic prophecy, but a typically comprehensive one, is reproduced in a free manner by Christ or the Evangelist. The Hebrew אוֹכֵל לַחְמִי, Sept. *ἐσθίων ἄρτους μου*, is here stronger, *τρώγων μετ' ἐμοῦ τὸν ἄρτον*, with allusion to the superabounding consummation of this in ver. 26. The Hebrew הִגְדִּיל עָלַי עָקֵב, Sept. very obscure *ἐμεγάλυνεν ἐπ' ἐμὲ πτερνισμόν*, is here quite simple and plain—*ἐπῆρεν ἐπ' ἐμὲ τὴν πτέρναν αὐτοῦ*. This last exhibits, in a figure of daring impudence, not merely the refractory revolt against the affectionate rule of the *teacher*, but by the *ἐπῆρεν* also the Satanic pride which trod under foot the humble Lord.[2] Comp. Heb. x. 29. From this mention of the uplifted foot in connection with the washing of the feet, there arise many thoughts which might be regarded as fanciful: we may refer to some of them in the words of others. Bengel in the Gnomon says, Tantum abest, ut fratrum pedes lavet! Hiller, in his life of Jesus in rhyme, thus speaks:—O humility unmatched: He washes the feet which trod upon Him!

Ver. 19. *Ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι* has not here, according to our feeling, the same absolute sense as in ch. viii. 24, though Luthardt regards it as just a repetition of that saying; but since the disciples' belief that Jesus was the Messiah is already taken for granted (see ver. 13), *ἵνα πιστεύσητε* means, rather, That ye may not cease to believe, or be led to mistake in this, comp. ch. xvi. 1. Augustin's solution is too narrow,—that I am He of whom *this* scripture speaks[3] more earnestly,—of whom this scripture *also*, as *all scripture* generally, speaks. For *ἡ γραφή* in connection with the citation is, as everywhere, said generally. Thus, that *everything* which *befalls* Me, even that which seems so repulsive to faith, is but the strict fulfilment of what was long ago foreseen and recorded; that I am the great typified

[1] Roos is too narrow when he says that although Jesus received attendance from others, yet now the disciples actually ate *His* bread. The profound and much more comprehensive expression needs no such justification.

[2] Which we may supplement here by way of improvement on our remarks in the Commentary.

[3] Nonnus: *ὅτι εἰμὶ ἐκεῖνος, τοῦ πέρι ψαλτῆρος ζαθέη μαντεύσατο φωνή.*

One throughout the Scriptures, and tell you before it has come to pass, in order that ye may see that I have not trusted him, he has not deceived *Me*, as Ahithophel did David, and many will you.

Ver. 20. It is constantly denied that this saying has any connection here with the preceding; and even Lücke joins with Gabler and Kuinoel in assuming it to be a gloss which has crept in from Matt. x. 40, or still better from Lu. ix. 48, and fallen to the end instead of following ver. 16, to which it should belong. But we see the connection most clearly, and find no link wanting; remembering, as said above, that the Lord is speaking in deep emotion, and that His contemplation passes from object to object abruptly, rather hinting His meaning than fully expressing it. There are many artificial methods of tracing the link which we must dismiss: the obvious one is the best, viz., that the honour of the Apostle's vocation would by no means be affected by either the present sin of this Judas, or the similar experience in the case of others which awaited them, ver. 18.[1] Is not this connection enough, is it not as it were the most befitting close of this entire discourse? The whole circle of the Apostles seemed to be disgraced and broken up by the treachery of Judas; and therefore the Lord *confirms* the faithful in their election, and that very fitly by a repetition of that earlier promise on which all depended. He does not design to say (B.-Crusius), "so much *greater* should be the dignity and honour of His faithful ones, they should be loved of God because they had kept themselves from the unfaithful." Such a comparative imports too much, but the positive

[1] Hezel finds here another exhortation to humility:—Remember that the honour which may be conferred on you, does not rest upon your persons but is Mine, even as I Myself give My honour back unto God!! Others again:—He who receiveth you shares your honour (but where is that said?), therefore overvalue not yourselves! Schleiermacher's, however, is a view somewhat more tolerable:—In humility and love we should come to others as sent of Him, that so we may be received; everywhere making it our care as servants to bring our Lord with us. But the point is brought out altogether too artificially. The penetrating Dräseke goes astray when he attributes to the Saviour the *tacita oppositio*:—Those, however, who receive *him* whom I send *not*, receive neither the Father nor Me! Meyer most strangely interprets it that the Lord promises to send *another* in the place of Judas, and exhorts the Apostles, by anticipation, to receive him affectionately into their circle.

sense remains: Be ye faithful ones of good courage, ye retain your honour as the messengers whom I shall soon send forth, the devil shall have no other among you![1] This is one thought which is obvious; but a deeper allusion must be added:—As I, though resisted by Judas, have been *received* by you and many others, so also shall ye not in vain be sent forth; your humble and laborious love shall not be contemned by all.

THE SECOND AND MORE DIRECT INDICATION OF THE TRAITOR, AFTER THE SUPPER.

(Chap. xiii. 26, 27.)

This is, according to our view of the whole procedure and connection, a *second* more direct indication of the traitor, which did not take place until after the supper. Thus there is no room for any contradiction between the Synoptics and St John. The *first* indication appears in vers. 21, 22, and coincides literally with what the Synoptics report; we, therefore, defer our exposition of ver. 21 to the last part of the work, and the context to which it belongs. The objection which Baur and many others urge so vehemently, that St John leaves no room anywhere for the insertion of the Supper, has been well answered by Hauff: no historical writer must be required designedly to show the place where circumstances which he omits should occur. We might satisfy ourselves with a confident *non liquet;* but every man must be allowed here his own unprejudiced opinion. Bengel's notion that ch. xiv. 31 first points to the going into the city to the passover, is assuredly the most violent and improbable supposition of any. We cannot interpolate the institution of the sacrament (with Paulus, Meyer, B.-Crusius, Kahnis) between vers. 30 and

[1] Rieger: "He revives their confidence again with regard to their future work, for the devil would take away from them all life and hope. Having accomplished his business with Judas, he would have all the rest think themselves no better than he—We are all disgraced, there is no faith among us, our whole order stinks. But no! The verily, verily, I say unto you, of Jesus, stands between them and despair. He can justify them to themselves, that they are sent of Him."

31, or (with Neander and Ebrard) between vers. 32 and 33;[1] nor can we insert it still later (with Lücke and Lange), nor (with Olshausen) at the end of the chapter, after ver. 38. The reasons for and against this decision must be referred at last to our own subjective feeling, although a profound examination of the question would afford much room for argument. We assume, for our own part, that the right place for its insertion is between vers. 22 and 23, notwithstanding the apparent continuity of the connection. For from ver. 23 down to ch. xiv. 31 everything seems to go on in an absolutely unbroken thread.

A correct harmony of the four Evangelists, and especially the letter of St Mark and St Luke, forbids us to doubt that Judas received the sacrament with the rest, being included, as the lost one, for a testimony in the "for you:" this has been generally assumed from the earliest times, and has never been contested save on internal grounds. The πλὴν ἰδού of Lu. xxii. 21 is not to be easily dismissed by a reference to the freedom of St Luke's connection generally (Ebrard); this would be an altogether too free transposition. The words are placed in our Lord's lips, as part of His continuous discourse; and this is a very different thing from the allusion to the strife in ἐγένετο δὲ καί, ver. 24, which we admit to be retrospective. Still less can we accept Wieseler's artificial application, who finds in the ἐπὶ τῆς τραπέζης a proof that the reference to the traitor had already preceded during the eating of the meal. To us the stern word of Mark xiv. 23 is unconditionally decisive—And they *all* drank of it (comp. Matt. xxvi. 27); for the *twelve* are mentioned in the context, without a single syllable about the removal of one of their number.[2]

We see in this πλήν of St Luke that the Saviour in the oppression of His spirit cannot, even after the institution of the

[1] Ebrard speaks very inappropriately of an open disclosure of the traitor while they were eating and before the sacrament; and then regards Jno. xiii. 31, 32 as a strictly suitable *introduction* to the supper.

[2] Everything in St John tends to this, wherever the Supper is inserted, but the Synoptics are most decisive. The rigorous consecution of events does not "tolerate" the idea of the absence of Judas (as Süskind Stud. u. Krit. 1852. 4. says too gently, after Wieseler). Kahnis in vain tries to persuade us that the words of institution are against the presence of Judas, since Jesus could not have said with regard to him—For *you!*

Supper, put away, as it were, the thought of the traitor. The serpent's sting is still keenly felt. The impious man departs not, remains quietly among them, and even joins in the question, Is it I?—he eats and drinks with them, and waits till the enforced command bids him go his way, that the Son of man may speak of His glorification and of His love. Once more there is a sharp conflict, between the man of sin and the pre-eminent Man of grace, the first-born of Satan and the Son of God—a final contest of love and gentleness for that wretched soul, though in the consciousness that the frightful issue will be that in the case of this soul at least the Devil will be the victor. The rest of the beloved disciples, too, cannot shake from their thoughts the fearful word, that a traitor was among them; the Lord's reiterated word, Lu. xxii. 21, 22, gives them the occasion of repeating their questioning as recorded in ver. 23, and this according to our harmony is the immediate parallel of Jno. xiii. 23.

"Who is the first among them, who can dismiss from his mind the personal question (Lord, *is it I?*), and turn his observation upon *the others?* Strange, that it is he who should have been the last, he who should have been most anxiously busy in testing himself—Simon Peter!" Thus says Dräseke, and with some measure of propriety. But we may also say with confidence, that now, after the supper, each one of the eleven must have known, in his own honest heart, that he was not the traitor. *Peter* and *John* come prominently forward, as the representatives of this consciousness—they sitting or lying, in all probability, on either side of Jesus. St John at least indicates his own position —*ἐν τῷ κόλπῳ* (comp. Lu. xvi. 22, and Jno. i. 18); that is, Jesus, according to custom, reclined on His left side, His head towards the table, His feet turned backwards in such a manner that the beloved John lay confidentially near His bosom. And as Peter is able thus secretly to hint his meaning to John, it is most natural to suppose that he was on the opposite side of Jesus, and either intimated what he had to say behind the Saviour's back, or, as the *νεύειν* may include, whispered it to John.[1] Peter's well-intended, but overcurious spirit of question-

[1] Nonnus, excellently, λάλῳ δ' ἐρέεινε σιωπῇ. We cannot approve, with Luthardt, of Lachmann's reading—καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ· Εἰπὲ τίς ἐστιν. Schulz'

ing, which goes on down to ch. xxi. 21, is very familiar to us; his curiosity led him afterwards, however, to his denial. We may regard a good intention as prompting the present question (Grotius: tum ut innoxii extra suspicionem sint, tum ut sibi caveant ab impuro); yet it is scarcely to be questioned that rather a kind of curiosity than any such reflection induced him to put it. Affecting and characteristic is the pure simplicity with which the beloved disciple fulfils the request of the curious one, even as afterwards, ch. xviii. 16, he introduced him into the palace of the high priest.[1] Similarly noteworthy and significant is the priority which *Peter* is constrained to concede to him who was nearer than himself.[2] But most affecting and most significant is it to observe, that Jesus can no more decline the request of the beloved *John*, than he could that of Peter. Peter himself might have received a similar answer to that which he afterwards received,—What is that to thee? Look into thyself!

Ver. 26. Nevertheless He mentions not the name; this was, on the one hand, impossible to His deep emotion, and, on the other, would have been audible to the rest:—He veils the reply in an accompanying sign. We are firmly convinced that *this* word, *softly* spoken to John, is quite different from that of Matt. xxvi. 23. For there Judas himself dips his hand in the dish, here the Lord dips and gives it; that word was not, properly speaking, an answer, but merely the reiterated general intimation—One of My familiar companions, now at the table with Me, one among you: for if He had had reference to an actual dipping of Judas at that moment, the continued ignorance of the disciples would have been inconceivable. Least of all can we tolerate the hypothetical question by which Braune (and Lange) would reconcile

argument that John never uses the *optative* has no force. That Peter attributes to the beloved John a knowledge of the traitor we do not regard as "characteristic" of him, but, rather, inconceivable; for Peter, though he might speak precipitately, never spoke thoughtlessly. The foundation of this reading may have been a correct gloss—a λέγειν may have been originally in the text.

[1] Hiller's remark seems quite unsuitable to John's character—"John takes the hint, being himself equally curious in this matter."

[2] Lampe: Videant Pontificii, quomodo Primatum Petro vindicent, cum Johannes primum et in mensa et in corde Christi locum obtineat, et Petrus ipse ejus patrocinio indigeat.

the two—"Did not Judas himself out of a certain presumption once more dip into the dish, because custom required it?" All is better harmonised, if we regard this as the *second* indication occurring after the principal meal. Then the ψωμίον would not be a portion of the paschal lamb, but intinctus panis as the Vulg. has it, and the ἔμβαμμα not the sauce of bitter herbs, but something else similar. More important than these trivialities is the *significance* of the word and sign, by which the Lord once more and conclusively confirms the prophecy of the Psalm, and makes His appeal to His most unworthy ἑταῖρος (Matt. xxvi. 50). The offered morsel is—to speak with Dräseke—"the affecting sign of a heretofore relation." And still more, it is an especial and confidential token of love, on account of which some of the rest might think the wretched man highly favoured.[1] This is His love unto the end even to the lost among His own; this is its final appeal to the hard heart.

But this very point marks the final decision and separation. In chap. vi. 70 it was said of Judas—διάβολός ἐστιν, but that was only the beginning. He had at this time already—after Satan's suggestion (here at ver. 2, what Luke xxii. 3, with less strict distinction, terms εἰσῆλθε δὲ σατανᾶς)—trafficked with the high priests, and pledged himself to the betrayal. But all this was not yet final, Satan now went further in the process of his destruction and put forth a more active influence upon him: but still there was some slight thread of connection with the grace and truth of God in Jesus, which might yet avail for salvation. Now, now first, *after* this sop (Bengel urges us to note well—not *with* it!) Satan, according to *St John's* most profound observation, entered into him—"took *full* possession of him"—or whatever else our language will allow for the rendering of the equally literal and figurative expression. Satan down to the very last develops his plans through external occasions and circumstances. But the external occasion is only the veil which conceals the unsuccessful contact and conflict of the love of Jesus with the wickedness of the traitor. It was not, as has been said, wrath at being now detected, which decided his course; for Judas

[1] Kahnis: "The prophecy becomes, at the moment of its disclosure, fulfilment. Remarkable, that the sign of it is a gift of love—it is love which challenges the evil to its utmost iniquity."

knew *that* with increasing certainty since Matt. xxvi. 25: and that the gift of this sop was intended to be a revelation of him *before the* disciples, could not and would not be needed by Judas, at this moment. Suffice, that in the awful τότε of the Evangelist there is reference to a hidden and most internal procedure, which only *one* profound glance discerned.[1]

Ver. 27. And the eye of Jesus is upon him. What a transition at this crisis, celebrated in hell and mourned in heaven! The last request of love—and then the *giving up* to a reprobate mind, to do the deed of reprobation. (Rom. i. 28.) On the one hand, it is, indeed, clear, from the position of the decisive ὃ ποιεῖς (*not*, what thou wilt do), that ποίησον is not equivalent to an absolute imperative for the deed, but can involve no other than the permission of devoting wrath, into which grace now suddenly changes.[2] Scriptural parallels of *such* an imperative are to be found, *e.g.*, in the word to Ahimaaz, 2 Sam. xviii. 23, still more definitely in God's tempting saying to Balaam, Num. xxii. 20,[3] most definitely in our Lord's own λύσατε, John ii. 19, and πληρώσατε Matt. xxiii. 32. Zech. xi. 12 also closely corresponds in prophecy. Nevertheless, on the other hand, the dignity of our Lord, who could not be absolutely betrayed by Judas but gave Himself freely up, requires that something actually imperative should be discerned in the words. Not as if (according to the strange notion of Cyril) the invocation was addressed to Satan, whose act alone that of the possessed Judas was; he into whom Satan enters thus is not possessed but *doeth* himself what he doeth, as the words here therefore expressly run. But it is, first, a *commandment* of the *obedience* of Jesus, surrendering Himself up to the Father's will, for it means—*I am ready*, and will not withstand thee! By no means is it (as Lange says)

[1] Not, as Hezel coarsely imagined, that his form, mien, and language were all such as if Satan had directly taken possession of him! Or, as Hess somewhat more cautiously, "Whosoever looked at him carefully might read it in his demeanour."

[2] Grotius addresses a similar mode of speaking from profane writers. Seneca: fac, si quid facis. Plautus: age, si quid agis. Euripides: δρᾶ γ' εἴ τι δράσεις.

[3] Less strictly parallel is the commission to the evil spirit, 1 Kings xxii. 22, because in this *figurative* presentation the רוּחַ שֶׁקֶר may yet have been a good spirit in the service of the Lord.

a request which has reference to the period of the sufferings of the victim under the sacrificial knife—"Let not my martyrdom *be long!*" Jesus, even here, when He obeys and yields Himself up, *rules over time and hour;* consequently the word is also, as Ambrose rightly saw, a command—*Get thee hence!*[1] and Judas, as Satan within him, must obey this behest. This is slightly perceptible in the τάχιον, which assuredly might be translated—citius quam prius voluisti. Thus this *second* word, finally, to the betrayer contains something majestic beyond that first, simply assenting Σὺ εἶπας of Matt. xxvi. 25. That signified, for the first,—I see through thee! *Thou knowest it*—I also! But still the deed lay in the future, as a design which Satan had put in his heart. Now, rather, when the *doing* (internally) begins in Judas:—What thou doest do; I not merely suffer it, I command thee to do it soon, now! Thou willest it—I also will it—thou hast Me in thy hands!

Nothing external betrayed the betrayer, the finished hypocrite, down to the last; so that the other disciples even in these words—"which their deeply-moved Master could not speak without an extraordinary emotion" (as Dräseke says)—discerned nothing extraordinary. Ebrard's view (S. 641 note) appears to us quite erroneous, that the disciples might have well known that Judas was the traitor, but that they did not believe the final accomplishment of his wicked purpose to be the matter in question just then. If Judas was indeed marked out to them as such, they could not have understood the mysterious ὃ ποιεῖς otherwise than of its real meaning; certainly, they could not have referred it to his ordinary business and duty. But it must be assumed that *no man* knew or observed anything, save John, who as the reporter of this ignorance excepts himself as having known, and *probably* Matthew also, see Matt. xxvi. 25. As it respects John, at least, the matter is clear from vers. 25, 26—which Luthardt's protest has forgotten. There had not been time enough to communicate the answer received even to Peter, between the closely connected giving of the sop, entering in of Satan, and command of Jesus—Do quickly! It is quite clear that their supposition as to the buying for the feast does not suit the day before

[1] Quite incorrect is Hess' conversion of this—"Jesus, *when He saw him arise* to depart, adds nothing but these words."

Thursday (for which, however, the critics make this a proof!), even as the hasty sending away from the table so late in the evening would then appear needless. Rather, as Guericke, Tholuck, and Luthardt rightly infer, they could have thought of this only if it was already the beginning of the festal evening, and thus the last moment in which anything neglected before might be procured for the feast. That, moreover, as Tholuck well remarks, "their suppositions were confused and distracted," appears by the second of them, which is still more improbable than the first. For the giving of alms was not so hasty a matter, and was much too late as a contribution towards the procurement of the paschal lamb. St John thus designs to describe to us the deep mystery of these occurrences, known only to himself, the beloved and trusted,—with the most artless embarrassment of all the rest.

One more most pregnant remark he gives at the conclusion of the whole, in the absolute and emphatic *ἦν δὲ νύξ*.[1] This does not simply intimate that it was late evening, but signifies something which corresponds with the previous mention of Satan. It was the breaking in of the hour of the power of darkness, Lu. xxii. 53. It was not needful, as Lücke requires, that St John should use *σκοτία*; the *νύξ* here intimates the coincidence of external and internal darkness. It was night *in the soul of Judas*—this also is included in it, by this fearful word the Evangelist dismisses him into the darkness without, with the yet deeper and more real night in his own spirit. It was night, further, in a broad circle around Judas, the leader and forerunner of the enemies of Jesus—night in the hearts of many, condensed and mighty darkness, to obscure the Light of the world in the fearfully hidden mystery of the Passion. *Nevertheless*—and this is its final emphasis in contrast with what follows—Jesus goes on to speak of His glorification, of His love, His departure to the Father, the coming of the Comforter, His own return with

[1] For *ὅτε ἐξῆλθε* must be connected (according to Lachmann's text) with the following verse, as the *οὖν* makes evident; and not with the previous (as Knapp has it). *Ὅτε ἐξῆλθε* following the sufficiently emphatic *εὐθέως ἐξῆλθεν* seems to us as bald, as the mere *Λέγει ὁ Ἰησοῦς* would be weak and unconnected. Bengel's critical feeling is here sacrificed to his marvellous harmony, according to which what follows was spoken by Jesus on the next morning.

peace, the victory over the world, eternal joy and glory—all words of light and life, which have approved their full meaning in the hearts of all who are not what Judas was,—in the overcoming and extinction of all darkness.

THE GLORIFICATION OF THE SON OF MAN; THE ENTRANCE INTO THE INACCESSIBLE; THE NEW COMMANDMENT.

(Ch. xiii. 31–35.)

Those who, with Bengel, interpose an entire night at this point, give up the force of this most significant and sublime *Νῦν*: it is scarcely imaginable that the Lord could have thus begun a new and abrupt discourse. The hypothesis which inserts here the institution of the Supper, gives a meaning, indeed, to the *Νῦν*, but does violence to the arrangement of the Evangelist. If we are told that vers. 31, 32 are an appropriate *introduction* to the Sacrament, we must avow that—apart from the unnatural disruption in the discourse, which runs on continuously from ver. 31 to ver. 38—our feeling cannot tolerate *after* the *νῦν ἐδοξάσθη* any further *σῶμα διδόμενον, αἷμα ἐκχυνόμενον.*—But St John's narrative and the entire scene becomes most clear and luminous, when we simply read it as it stands:—*εὐθέως ἐξῆλθεν—ὅτε οὖν ἐξῆλθε, λέγει ὁ Ἰησοῦς.*

What says He, and of what does He speak? Nothing further of Judas now; not until ch. xvii. 12 does His thought revert in deepest sorrow to the betrayer.

No, the Lord now pours forth *His last discourses*, which delayed His setting forth, and the *beginning of which*[1] is this *νῦν ἐδοξάσθη* ("a cry of exultation in the night in which He was betrayed")—the *end* of which is the High-priestly prayer—the *middle* of which is the *μὴ ταρασσέσθω ὑμῶν ἡ καρδία*, the incentive to *faith εἰς τὸν θεὸν καὶ εἰς ἐμέ*—the *goal* set before the disciples, their *πιστεύομεν*, His *ἄρτι πιστεύετε*, ch. xvi. 30, 31.

The relation of the Νῦν,—which even now at this first outpouring anticipates the final petition (*δόξασόν σου τὸν υἱὸν, δόξασόν με σὺ πάτερ*) as fulfilled,—*to the departure of Judas* does

[1] Which Luthardt also I. 267 admits and defends.

not consist in this, that Judas was a hindrance to the glorification, since his deed of darkness was to be instrumental in accelerating it. But there is a twofold thought to be traced here:—First, by the act of the traitor, now decisively commencing, the death of Jesus, that is, His glorification, now appears to be as a fact accomplished; and then, secondly, Jesus, after the removal of this opposing instrument of hell, this vainly loved one, over whose spirit He in the spirit had won the great *victory*,[1] can now first *speak* ἐν παῤῥησίᾳ concerning His glory. Jam quasi obice rupto torrentes gratiæ a labiis Jesu effunduntur—says Lampe.[2] And His words presently uttered, vers. 31–35, determine, if we will hear them, the old controversy between *faith* and *love*, as to which of them is the first, whether the ἀγάπη μετὰ πίστεως, Eph. vi. 23, or the πίστις δι' ἀγάπης ἐνεργουμένη, Gal. v. 6. Neither of the two, if both are genuine and inseparable in one! Faith, truly, is the source, ground, and energy of the new creature; but a faith to which love is promised, of which love is predicated, and to which love is commanded in the working of the life-giving law of Christ. We have here in our Lord's words two *parallel* and *perfectly corresponsive* sayings:—a word for knowledge in order to *faith;* and a word for the heart (or the living truth of this knowledge) concerning *love*. The *one dogma* is the glorification of God in the Son of man, as of the Son of man in God; the *one commandment* the mutual love of His disciples, because and even as He loved them.

Ver. 31. Does the Lord's ἐδοξάσθη speak by anticipation of His *heavenly* exaltation? No more than in chap. xii. 23, 28, 33, to which this word looks back. The νῦν of itself is positive against this; and in ver. 32 the εὐθύς introduces first the antithetical, though closely connected, future δοξάσει. Consequently, while we must regard both glorifications as forming but one and the same, the one following immediately from the other, the distinction must be maintained that this *present* glorification is

[1] See Lange S. 1328 ff. upon this, and my exposition of Matt. xxvi. 24.

[2] Only that the glorification itself, of which He speaks, is something very different from what the tasteful Herder most tastelessly expresses:—"Now is the Son of man *satisfied among His own*—for their fellowship is purified!!"—Luthardt will find that which he adduces to supplement my meaning (ii. 290) laid down by myself as the fundamental thought.

the beginning and ground of *that which follows* as its consummation. In no other than the *death of the cross*, now regarded by Jesus as coming and come, present and accomplished, is the Son of man first of all glorified:—in this humiliation He is exalted, in this darkness of shame does His glory beam forth, from Golgotha go forth those attracting energies which are to wrest from Satan the world of mankind. At His proleptic glorification on the mount He spoke of His passion; but now from the beginning of His passion He speaks of His glorification. As *for Israel* the superscription upon the cross points out the *King* (and thereby repels every false and carnal notion of His kingdom)—so for *humanity at large* this word is the interpretation of the passion: Here is the *Son of man* thus glorified, so that *God in Him* is glorified!

But the glorification of God in the suffering and dying Son of man is a broad and deep comprehensive truth which we can perfectly apprehend only in three aspects. It embraces, first, when we *look into it*, the self-offering of God in the *person* of *this* Son of man as a great and solitary fact; secondly, when we *look back*, the shining forth of God in *human nature* generally, as the longed for goal of all aspiration and effort; thirdly, when we *look forward*, the *representation and offering* of God to humanity as the object of faith and love.

God is glorified ἐν αὐτῷ—assuredly *not* δι' αὐτοῦ, therefore, as we find it in Nonnus; as Erasmus' false correction of the Vulg. by *per eum* translates it; and as Lücke also insists, on the erroneous assumption that it is one with chap. xvii. 1, notwithstanding the decisive parallel of ἐν ἑαυτῷ in the next verse to our text.[1] Thus the Lord means, first of all, in Me, as Man, in *this* Son of man! This ὁ θεὸς ἐδοξάσθη ἐν αὐτῷ could be said of no בֶּן־אָדָם before, of *none* after until he is one with Christ:—in this consists the pre-eminent personal δόξα of the One. As the second man He is at the same time the Lord from Heaven (1 Cor. xv. 47)—ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ (Heb. i. 3).—His δόξα is the δόξα τοῦ μονογενοῦς παρὰ πατρός. Thus in a certain sense God had been revealed and glorified in His entire human life; as we sing concerning the *infant* Jesus—"The Father's light and love beam forth from His new-born face; He

[1] Which, however, de Wette arbitrarily translates—*durch* sich selbst!

is the Sun of the new heaven, which sheds light upon the world otherwise sunk in darkness" (Freilinghausen). But who beheld this radiance of the Father's light and love? Who could utter St. John's ἐθεασάμεθα, among the children of men? The wor shipping wise men were not wise enough to discern God in the child new born—no Apostle fell before Him with Thomas' cry —Mary herself had but a faint presentiment of the hidden mystery. Yea, after thirty years during which the still light of His love had beamed forth from His graciousness at Nazareth, He began to manifest His glory:—the *power* of God in all His works down to the grave of Lazarus, the *love* of God in all His tenderness and humility towards the wretched. Yea, verily, throughout all His life, He stood before a God-dishonouring world—I honour My Father! The Father honoureth Me! *Of that* spake the voice—I *have* glorified My name! Jno. xii. 28. But still there followed then—καὶ πάλιν δοξάσω. And this had its wondrous accomplishment first in His *sufferings and death.* The great question then was, whether the Righteous One would approve Himself such, and be confirmed of the Father as sent to save and not to judge the world. He had finished the *work* of His *life*—but the greatest work, the work which gave all the rest its consummation, was still reserved for His passion. How then in this deepest ignominy is the highest honour, the glory of God, manifested? Precisely when all the sin of the world is exhibited around Him, closes in upon Him, and lies upon His spirit so that He is made sin—He is most gloriously manifested as *without* sin, as contending *against* sin, as supremely elevated *above* sin, even while He *bears* it. The *love* which shone brighter and brighter in the feet-washing and the supper, in its majesty of meekness and patience with Judas, is now glorified into an absolute and final victory over the hatred of hell. Not as elsewhere, that the Divine is darkened in the most devout Endurer—here there is the purest separation between light and darkness. It is night in Judas and in all His enemies, night comes into His own human soul, even to His Eloi, Eloi—but this Eloi! Eloi! remains uninvaded, light in the midst of darkness. As in the night on which He was born, heavenly glory shone around, so now after the night of His betrayal there is darkness even in the midst of day. *Nevertheless,*

out of Golgotha's deep obscurity there shines forth victoriously, —the *righteousness* of God, a first glorification already of the righteous Father—the *love* of God, which reveals itself and gives itself to us in this conquering Son of His love—thus, grace in justice, justice in grace, that is, the mystery of the *holiness* of God becomes manifest. Thus the purest *honour of God* shines forth in the deepest dishonour of this *Son of man.* All is human and all is Divine, the Father in Him performeth the work of this world-redeeming passion. The Ecce Homo is changed to the eye of faith into—*Behold Thy God!* In this man become thine, O humanity!

Thus we find in it, *secondly*, and looking backwards, the penetration of human nature by God as the longed-for goal of all human aspiration and seeking. But how was this aspired to before Christ? In the old covenant the grace which stooped to man wrestles from the beginning with sin, but cannot at once victoriously break through, because man's freedom must oppose his God, because the human nature must in its ground and universality be prepared for the revelation of God in it. Hence all was simple preparation, an aspiration and seeking awakened from above:—that is the deep-implanted mystical *germ* of Christ the Son of man, in whom finally dwelleth God. In spite of all Israel's hardness of heart, which therein represents humanity, God's honour and glory remained, for the sake of their germ of faith, *among* and *upon* them; but its design is to *come into them.* How sore was the conflict and wrestling of the Angel of the covenant with Jacob before His becoming man in the true Israel; of the Spirit of Christ in the people of flesh! Yea, at best it became an Israel which, like Simeon and Nathanael, waits; *types* of, and *preparations* for atoning sufferings are found from David down to the servant of God, Isa. liii.—but all is no more than aspiration and waiting. That Lev. xxvi. 11 should become a reality (comp. 2 Cor. vi. 16) remains ever the goal of their future. Daniel prophesies how, after the destruction of the *animal* might of all the kingdoms of the world, the true and holy *Son of man* comes before God and receives the kingdom of a God-pervaded pure *humanity* as the kingdom of God. That is the goal of Israel attained in Christ; for He is this Son of man, as the true David, the righteous servant Israel. He is *the new man in*

God, the *blossom* and *fruit* of humanity which had at length burst forth on the stem of Israel, through the faith of Mary uniting at length Abraham and Sarah in one. Not, as the old theology supposed, the suddenly descending Deus ex machinâ—for One who thus became man would not be properly and truly at the same time the Son of man. But still less, as the new unbelief supposes, altogether and solely springing up here below; the impregnation from above was consummated in the overshadowing of the Holy Ghost, and only the eternal Son of the Father in the Son of Mary overcame sin and the world even to the glorification on the cross. But here is all that obscurer longing, aspiration, and search of *entire humanity* realised; for here the old discord is abolished, here God is in man and man in God. Humanity had not, indeed, utterly and for ever fallen away from God, else would it have been with Satan irredeemably lost; but that men, even the Gentiles, are still the offspring of God, is plainly proved by the seeking and feeling after Him who is *not far* from them, and yet so utterly unknown (Acts xvii.). Consciously and unconsciously all mankind seeks Him—and that rightly *in itself*, for not merely from without and above can God manifest Himself to His personal and free creatures. God meets this seeking after Him by preparatory grace; and this is a mystical Christ before Christ. Wherever the heathens came near to the true God, they became therein one with Israel; and so now they find with Israel *in Christ* the goal of all realisation. Never in other way—never independently of the person of *this* Son of man!

In this Jesus, and in Him alone, at first, because He is the incarnate Son of God, is human nature glorified into a Divine-humanity. This is the *new dogma*, the one and sole essential proposition for *faith*, which involves in itself, however, the whole fulness of theology—the simple apostolical saying, *God was in Christ*. Indeed, as the new commandment of love was no other than the old one, so also this dogma is no more than the truth, fulfilment and re-establishment of that old and first truth—Man the image and glory of God, God in man. But the *person of Christ* in its *individuality* makes here the difference between the truth and its fearful perversion in that revived doctrine of the abyss—Hegelianism, which recognises no God who became man

in time, but one who is eternally becoming man, which declares the whole of fallen humanity with its (denied) sin to be the Son of God, and calls *that* the glorification of God in man—but it is no other than the seditious Barabbas put in place of the Saviour.

Believe first *in God* (with Israel), and then, therefore, therein, *in Me!* Thus speaks the Lord afterwards, ch. xiv. 1. The so-called faith *in humanity* is reduced to confusion and put to scorn by *sin*. Where then, and in what son of man and child of Adam apart from Christ, does God receive the full tribute of His glory? No other man comes in his own prerogative to God, to the Father, than He who uttered Jno. xiv. 6. There is no other God and Father than He whom we behold in Christ, according to Jno. xiv. 9.

Finally, *how* and *where* do we attain to this *seeing?* We see not God in Christ as He sits in majesty at the right hand of the Father—our *looking up into heaven* after the manner of the men of Galilee (Acts i. 11) would remain without power and without result. It is said here, Jno. xiii. 33—Ye cannot at once come after and unto Me there! It is *on the cross* that we are to find Him first of all, there He is exalted for us, and thus the glorification of God in the Son of man is, *thirdly*, the *exhibition* or *offering* of God to entire humanity as the object of faith and love. Here love is manifested and offers itself to our faith, that we may be sanctified in love. The world is redeemed, and now goeth forth the word of reconciliation, and in it the Spirit. The heavenly glorification of the Son of man, in whom God was now already glorified, in God Himself, was to be self-understood, even as the Lord made it follow in ver. 32. And if the faith of the disciples had been perfect, they would have drawn the same conclusion themselves. We can now draw it *with them*, and say of the Crucified and Risen—It is the Lord, the Lord of glory! Nevertheless, this faith rests solely *upon*, and grows solely *out* of the fundamental truth,—God *was* in the propitiating suffering Christ. Here is not merely the kernel and centre, but actually all in One. Whatever in the opinions or even in the confessions of our faith does not essentially, livingly, inwardly hang together *with this*, is not fundamental to holiness and salvation; but *at the cross the distinction is made* between Christianity and pseudo-Christianity. Worshipping before the Crucified, and as

crucified to call Him our Lord and God—to this we are led by that fearing and seeking faith in God which must precede it; and all sincere seekers out of an old covenant cry here, each one at his hour, the final, blessed εὑρήκαμεν, before which the prejudices of every Nathanael give way. And the Crucified Himself meets them, in His word and Spirit, with the cry—I am He! Philip then no longer desires to see the Father in any other way; for here is God *before* us, God *with* us, God *for* us—and become God *in* us. Dost thou feel the serpent's bite, poor child of Adam? Here is the Lord thy Physician exalted in the form of the serpent! Behold Him; so hear the word from the cross that it may become to thee a seeing—in spite of all the sophistry which would bewitch thee not to obey the truth,—let this figure be painted before thine eyes! And who is the exhibitor of it? Who is the Glorifier of the glorified Christ both for our hearts and our minds? The Holy Ghost, who exhibits Him in the words of the Evangelists and in the apostolical preaching which to this day has never ceased. And what is the fruit of this glorification? A faith in Him who first loved, who becomes *love* in us; as the Lord will proceed to show further on in this chapter.

Ver. 32. After this extended exposition of the first verse, for the preaching tone of which we do not so much ask forgiveness as acceptance, there yet remain a few observations upon the following. The Lord speaks of a *twofold* glorification. He is, first of all, made perfect in obedience through suffering as the ἀρχηγὸς τῆς σωτηρίας for the entire race of mankind; His dying becomes the ἀκμὴ of His divinely-loving and self-sacrificing life, and thus the *image of God in man* is once more restored, and exhibited to us. This honour of God in Him is His first and true honour, without which there would have been nothing to be said of any future honour, or indeed of any other. Yet there *follows* immediately from this, according, as it were, to the advancing revelation of His career—The Dying One rising again, and ascending to heaven—the *glorification of the Son of man in God.* This logical *deduction*, as it is drawn by our Lord's anticipatory trust, lies in the repetition of the former clause with εἰ, which will be regarded as "strange and gloss-like," or "feebly repeating" (Luthardt) only by such as miss its profound meaning in this

place. Its absence in many important authorities is to be explained either by that general lack of discernment as to the true meaning of the passage, or by resorting to ὁμοιοτέλευτον. The apparent tautology is quite in harmony with the character of the discourses which now begin, and which are full of such resuming deductions. B.-Crusius is perfectly right in saying (after Grotius), that this εἰ is *not* used hypothetically, but introduces the argument of an inference, being equivalent to *quandoquidem*. The kernel of that inference lies in the necessarily corresponding *recompense* which the Son sanctified for His own asks and receives from the Father, as it comes prominently forward in ch. xvii.—I have glorified Thee; and now glorify Thou Me! The fundamental principle of 1 Sam. ii. 30 (Sept. τοὺς δοξάζοντάς με δοξάσω), which Grotius adduces, finds here in fact its highest application, as Origen expressed it: ἀντιδωρεῖται αὐτῷ ὁ πατὴρ τὸ μεῖζον, οὗ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου πεποίηκεν. This μεῖζον lies as a μέγιστον in the ἐν ἑαυτῷ, for which indeed in ch. xvii. 5 παρὰ σεαυτῷ stands; yet that must be interpreted by this, and not conversely. "As by Him and in Him as the Son of man God was glorified, the glory of the Divine life stamped upon His life in the flesh, so now the Son of man, as the exhibitor of the new life-type, is by God, in His well-pleased recognition of His accomplished work of glorification, *taken up into His own Divine life and glory*." (Beck S. 610.) And there is a fine truth in the observation that Jesus first spoke "under the strong impulse of prophetical prolepsis, as if all was overcome already"—and then "as the high emotion sinks down again" He returns to the distinction καὶ εὐθὺς δοξάσει. Yet Lücke, who makes this observation, guards against the misapprehension that on that account the concluding glorification is the same as the preceding. For it is not an "old misconception," but a scriptural truth, that here (as in ch. xii. 28) the discourse is of a twofold (though really the same) δοξάζειν. The εὐθύς, finally, does not mean to say that His death itself was to be this *second* glorification[1]—though this "Johannæan view" is generally appealed to with approbation; but immediately thereupon, *suddenly*, to the astonishment of the world and even of the disciples, His

[1] For which Lücke cites Euthymius, ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ σταυρῷ.

resurrection and glorification was to follow. Luthardt's protest against this exposition of mine finds but a poor justification in interpreting εὐθύς—with the *presently* beginning sufferings! The essential unity of the δοξάζειν, which I have by no means desired, does most manifestly resolve itself into a twofold glorification through the quick succession of the "death and resurrection," of the deepest abasement and the highest exaltation.[1]

Ver. 33. The Master, after these lofty words, which are too high for the weakness of the disciples, stoops not simply with a brotherly but with a fatherly love to His *children*. This is something quite different from the φίλοι of ch. xv. 15, yea, in a certain sense, is its opposite. The meaning of this expression, occurring only here in our Lord's lips,[2] is by no means exhausted by saying that "the tone of the departing Master becomes more tender and confidential." In its tenderness of affection the solemn truth must be discerned, that these weak disciples whom the Lord by anticipation calls friends, and draws upwards to Himself in love, and for their *future* understanding greets with the utterance of such high mysteries, are yet for the time no more than new-born babes, and far from the goal marked out in Eph. iv. 13. (Peter, ver. 37, would be a man before the time!) Therefore says He *now*, and for the *present*, to these His dear children, the same thing which He had twice before said (ch. vii. 34, viii. 21) to the unbelieving and opposing *Jews*,[3] though obviously in a different sense.[4] Whence we may take note, as

[1] Consequently, it harmonises well with a *twofold* glorification that "the receding emotion returned into the καὶ εὐθὺς δοξάσει, which establishes the distinction," as Lücke's words obviously say—though Luthardt has not read them.

[2] For τέκνα, Mar. x. 24, is not altogether the same.

[3] Καὶ ὑμῖν λέγω ἄρτι is incorrectly referred by Luther to the following verse, the δίδωμι of which needed no preparatory λέγω.

[4] The ἄρτι appears to us not to look backwards, as Luthardt thinks, quoting Meyer with approval:—"He could not longer spare them this declaration," and Bengel: noluit discipulis citius hoc dicere, infidelibus dixit citius. But it is a limiting "*for the present*," which looks forward to His glory—as the Lord presently explains it Himself, ver. 36, by νῦν (Luth. für diesmal), which Peter substitutes for ἄρτι: see, moreover, ch. xiv. 3, xvi. 22, xvii. 24.

Olshausen observes, "that the Redeemer Himself takes pleasure in using the same sayings with diverse references." The two statements there uttered to the Jews—Ye shall *not find* Me, ye shall *die in your sins*, are necessarily wanting here. There was, assuredly, in these words of departure and severance—Whither I go *ye cannot come*, "something inexpressibly troubling," and "we must lose sight of the emphasis which Jesus places upon the *cannot*." (Dräseke.) He thereby, not merely returning back again down to His own in the world, but actually looking forward in prophecy, intimates that His glorifying assumption *to God* would partake the character, as for the world so also for His believers, of a *concealment* until the time of a final *revelation*. (Col. iii. 3, 4.) That the Son of man is glorified in God Himself, abides the hidden and high object and goal of *faith*. As we cannot with our bodies at once go up to heaven, so cannot we in our spiritual life become at once heavenly like Him; *therefore*, also, we cannot at once ascend in our knowledge and spiritual apprehension to Jesus. Even this does not yet *behold* His glory. All our dogmatic persuasion of faith concerning His sitting at the right hand of God would hence be without effect in drawing and purifying us to Himself, if He had not been first glorified *for us* in humiliation, upon the cross. Therefore the Lord speaks of a *seeking*, but in the case of His own of a seeking to which the promise of *finding* is given. The *heart* with its *love* seeks *the Crucified*, even where the faith of knowledge wavers or is yet unestablished; in that love is the genuine germ of faith, and thus seeking it findeth ever more and more the Risen and the Glorified. (St Mark xvi. 6.) Yea, the heart believes, perceives, and lives on into experience, through the influence of the love-awakening glorification of Him who suffered and died in love. *This* is the deep connection and transition in the discourse between ver. 33 and ver. 34, between the one dogma of the glorification of the Son of man and the one ἐντολή which points to love. We reach, indeed, love through faith; but through love alone we live ourselves (dying to the old life) into the fulness of faith. None of the learned expositors, as far as we know, has perceived this; it has entered the minds only of those practical expositors, who have read with their hearts and for their hearts. Dräseke: "Your desire after Me

is the main condition of our further fellowship. I am so long and so certainly yours, as ye seek Me with hearts full of love." Again, "With no other design did He place in the connection of our text this new commandment, than because He would say —*Love, little children, that ye may understand Me.* Love, that I may be able to glorify you in My glory."[1] Braune, too: "I am upon the Father's throne, but because visible tokens thereof fail, all is mystery to you and sometimes doubtful: I triumph, and sorrow oppresses you, the mighty tremble and their empire is passing away, but ye hide yourselves and are in dismay. *Yet is there a way to Myself open to you:* Love one another!" That is, In My love, from love to Me, because and as I have *loved* you.

Ver. 34. If the καινὴ διαθήκη, of which the sacramental institution speaks, refers to Ex. xxiv. 8, comp. Jer. xxxi. 31, so without doubt (and let this be a note of the bond of unity between St John and the Synoptics) the ἐντολὴ καινή stands in the strictest connection with this. For to a covenant belongs a law-giving.[2] Even here, where the beginning and the foundation of the covenant is the perfect self-sacrifice of the Lord for and in the sinner which must first take place, there must not be wanting some condition or obligation on the part of the sinners thus reconciled and sanctified. The old covenant was founded upon free prevenient grace in the call of Abraham, in the promised and fulfilled redemption of his seed (Ex. xix. 5), yet its proper consummation did not take place but in the sprinkling of the sacrificial blood *after* the commandments of Sinai (see Heb. ix. 19); so that it was a covenant of commandments. *Here* we cannot think otherwise than that the propitiating self-offering love has *previously* borne witness to itself in the Last Supper, before the ἐντολὴ καινή follows: and this gives us a forcible reason for not inserting its institution later. In any case, the close relation between the covenant and the new com-

[1] Predigten über die letzten Schicksale unsres Herrn, i. 214, and ii. 86.

[2] Yet both are not one and the same, *not* (according to Lange) that the appointment of the Sacrament is itself to be understood in the ἐντολὴ καινή; for this opposes all our previous exposition of this pregnant word. Not "a new institution," but every old precept of love is condensed into one new precept in Him, as St John's epistle has authentically expounded it.

mandment remains undeniable;[1] *from this* and from nothing else must we set out in solving the question (dealt with by most expositors with such unbelieving want of insight)—In what consists the *newness* of this precept.

We cannot here agree with the venerable v. Meyer, who elsewhere so often hits most acutely the meaning of Scripture. He begins rightly, "the true commandment of the New Testament," but then immediately goes astray, "in opposition to the ritual law and the pharisaic teaching, and even to the notions of the Apostles; newer than that of following Him (the most pre-eminent as long as He was upon earth); the newest among many, yea, the sole and distinctive law." The opposition to the precepts of the Pharisees, and to the notions of the Apostles still entangled more or less in them, has no application here, for it is the lawgiving on Sinai which is here the question; nor must we refer exclusively to the ritual law, since it is to the old covenant of the ten words to which the new covenant with its one word is opposed. And as to its opposition to the earlier precept (preliminary?) of following Christ, that is not simply superficial but altogether unfounded. This notion takes its origin from Bengel, who has been entirely misled here by his false harmony, so that his note sets out with this error: "This precept is called new, *not* so much with respect to the O. T., as in respect to the school of Christ!" He then says: "Previously the *following* of Jesus in His several steps had guided the disciples, and this implicitly included love; but they cannot follow Him now that He is departing from them, and therefore the sum of their duty is prescribed to them thus." For, is not the loving, because and as He has loved, yea the giving up of life for the brethren for His sake, itself the following of Christ, its essential development? Ver. 36. Did the Lord ever intend His previous commandment to follow Him, in any other sense?

We must, in order to understand the new commandment as *new*, ask solely and inquire what is the distinctive character of the *New Testament*, in as far as it also has a lawgiving. Now that is not to be found in love itself and of itself, nor in its *intenser*

[1] Bengel's Harmony, which transposes chaps. xiii. and xiv. to the Wednesday, dissolves this connection; and by that circumstance of itself is sufficiently refuted.

power, nor in its *restricting* concentration :—and thus we reject at once the most current interpretations. In his first Epistle, ch. ii. 7, 8, the Evangelist undeniably refers to this present utterance of our Lord as given in his own gospel, and furnishes the right commentary upon it. But we cannot, with most expositors, refer the ἀπ' ἀρχῆς in ver. 7 of that chapter simply to the beginning of Christianity; but we understand it unhesitatingly, with the ancients, that the commandment was the *old* commandment from the time of the old covenant and law. The λόγος, which they had heard from the beginning, is not merely the word and precept of Jesus as in vers. 3–5, but the meaning goes onwards by ἀπ' ἀρχῆς to say that this word of Jesus is identical with every word and commandment of God from the beginning. Mark, moreover, the explanation of ἀπ' ἀρχῆς in ch. iii. 11, 12, which goes back to the beginning of Scripture immediately after Adam's fall; and, again, that in ch. v. 2, 3 this love is referred to the ἐντολὰς τοῦ θεοῦ generally. Again, let the decisive antithesis in ch. ii. 8 be well noted, according to which the old commandment is made a new one coincidently with the outburst of the light after the darkness, that is, in connection with the New Testament grace in Christ. Thus, that we should love God first, and then for God's sake our neighbour, our brother, in God, is not a new thing in Israel:—this is attested by the tenor of the instruction and exhortation of the Deuteronomy, which spiritualises the decalogue, and *so far* points forward to its great fulfilment, though at the same time it gives thereby no other than its true meaning. Nor is it anything new in the world generally, so far as it knows φύσει and even performs τὰ τοῦ νόμου; for the world of heathenism speaks much about love.[1] Further, the newness and distinctiveness of the New-Testament precept of love cannot consist in the intenser degree of its self-sacrificing devotion—as Knapp supposes himself to have proved, Tholuck and Lücke following him; and as many of the ancients likewise held. It is specious but incorrect to say that in the

[1] Thus we do not agree with Sander's comment on the Epistles of St John, which treats most incorrectly the ἀπ' ἀρχῆς of this passage. Refutation of his errors would take us too far; but we may refer to the one point, that while in the *second* Epistle vers. 5, 6 apply the thought differently, this decides nothing for the first Epistle.

Old Testament the main element even of love is the principle of justice and equivalent, the *jus talionis*,—as I love myself and would be loved by my neighbour, so must I love him—while, in the New Testament the spirit and meaning of Christ goes far beyond this; man, as Cyril says, being required and enabled to love others *οὐχ ὡς ἑαυτὸν ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ ἑαυτόν* in which Euthymius concurs, as may be seen in Lücke. For, first, there is nothing in the word of Jesus about this especial intensification, but it rather adheres to the righteousness of the mutual *ἀλλήλους*; and, then, the whole notion of this distinction is oblique and unreal, as Olshausen properly though not fundamentally enough shows. "The true love, which is the nature of God Himself, is everywhere one and the same; it is not now *more* and then *less*." Yea, verily, *God's* precept even in the Old Testament knows and inculcates no other love than that which consists in unselfish devotion; and beyond *this* justice and holiness in the sight of God, beyond this perfect commandment, *there is no other and no greater*, as our Saviour's quotation of the old law, Mark xii. 31, expressly testifies. Would we place Christ in St Mark and Christ in St John in contradiction? The imperfection of the Old-Testament law does not lie in this, that it prescribes a lower degree of love and holiness (for there can be nothing higher than—Be ye holy as I am holy!), but in its confronting, imposing, legal character, without power for its fulfilment.

Least of all may we seek the newness of the commandment of Christ in the especial restriction or even concentration of love upon the narrow circle of the brethren united in the bonds of common devotion to Him. Grotius: Novum dicit, quia non agit de dilectione communii omnium—sed de speciali Christianorum inter se quâ tales sunt. Against which Tholuck protests, "How can that be called a new precept, when this *peculiar love* was not only admitted by the Jews, but by them carried to excess?" It is most strange to introduce here in the New Covenant, in which the Lord gives Himself for many, yea, for all, the partiality of love, even though based upon the spiritual brotherhood of His people. We shall see hereafter abundant evidence that, despite all appearances, He does not give so exclusive a meaning to His *φιλαδελφία*. Kölbing has lately, with

his Moravian honesty of intention, laboured strenuously for this superficial and current interpretation of our passage.[1] In all the discourse of this sacred evening, the Lord is "occupied especially with His disciples, and with their peculiar relations to Him and to one another." Quite true, but is He not also concerned with their testimony to the world, in order to the future progressive extension of this first circle of disciples? This alone would infer something very different from an exclusive limitation of love to the circle of believers at any time extant. Kölbing again protests vehemently against the evil that "now-a-days the love of our neighbour and brotherly love are regarded as one and the same, and as having precisely the same significance"—and declares that "in all ages, and especially in our own, it is highly important that the consciousness of the *distinction* between general love and brotherly love should be kept alive in the church." Quite right, in its degree and in its place; provided that a restricted brotherly love is not thereby made the essential and distinguishing characteristic of the *New Testament*, and asserted to be the proper meaning of our Lord's utterance on this occasion. In S. 689 we find a very suspicious misinterpretation of the New Testament name of brother, which the Lord in the Sermon on the Mount uses for every fellow-man (not merely for every fellow-Israelite!), just as St James ch. iv. 11 uses ἀδελφός for the πλησίον of the Old Testament law, in ch. ii. 8, referring it also in this chapter to the Gentiles who might enter into the assembly. By what token are we to know with certainty, in the midst of a Christian people all under the obligations and blessed with the grace of baptism, to whom we are altogether to refuse our especial brotherly love? And are our Missionary speakers wrong in speaking of love towards our poor *brethren* without, equally redeemed with ourselves? Then this restriction is in appearance only, and will not stand the test. Although assuredly the love which Christ less commands than brings, creates, and bestows, will have a hearth in which it may be properly said to be kindled, and from which it diffuses its warmth, in the especial fellowship of those who are to that end born again

[1] In which S. 686 we find also a great error as to the Old Testament and the relation to it of the Sermon on the Mount.

through Him, yet according to His spirit and His design this fellowship is not anything exclusive and shut in, but embraces with all the strength of united love the entire world, which is by this love to be won and redeemed from its sin. Thus we exhibit and extend, not independently of and in connection with, but *in and with* this brotherly love, that universal love which is therefore itself called generally and absolutely *ἀγάπη*. (2 Pet. i. 7.) If we are mutually to love one another, and that with an anticipating spontaneous self-offering love, which alone is true love, its extension to all follows of necessity—to those whom we yet know not, but who are our *future* brethren redeemed like ourselves by the Lord. Only then do we love, *as He hath loved us!* Or, did He actually give up His life *only* for His friends, as from Jno. xv. 13 has been most inappropriately urged? Could that which the Apostle testifies concerning the *love of enemies*, Rom. v. 6–10, from the death of Christ, yea of overcoming evil with good, ch. xii. 20, 21, even out of the Old Testament, surpass in any sense the meaning of Christ Himself? Let Matt. v. 47, 48, be pondered as His solemn word even for the narrowest, truest brotherhood of His kingdom! We gladly concur with Lücke: "Since the fellowship of the Divine kingdom embraces all that bears in it the seed and germ of the Divine life (better—that should receive), so the New Testament circle of love is the widest imaginable, in which the Jewish bigot-question has no place—Who is my neighbour (or even brother)? The restriction is only apparent, in reality it means the widest extension." Yes, verily, the fire of love must be concentrated upon the hearth of confirmed fellowship in Him, only that it may beam forth the more mightily upon all the world.

All this, then, not sufficing to approve itself the true interpretation of the *καινή*—what is its meaning? We regard it, pressing still from the external into the internal, as consisting, first, in the simplicity and plainness of the *expression*, as it respects the *form*—then, and pre-eminently, in the perfection of the new, now first existing *type*, in the *power of fulfilment* which flows from this *life-giving* type, which is more than a mere type—and, consequently, in the *abiding living newness* of this *ἐντολή*.

As all the dogmatics of the new teaching for faith was found

to coincide in that single expression, God in man, that is, in Christ—so is all the lawgiving of the New Covenant embraced simply and singly in that one word concerning love.[1] Thus did the veteran John represent it in his well-known word to the church of Ephesus; and in this there is assuredly an element of newness, in contradistinction to the many and yet vain commandments of the old covenant. The word of Christ and His Spirit does, indeed, resolve the obligation of love into its inexhaustible variety of duties; but this manifoldness could never *before* be at the same time *so clearly and plainly reduced back into one*—not in the intimation of Lev. xix. 18 (itself between individual precepts)—as it is in Matt. xxii., and Rom. xiii. 8–10.

Whence comes this? *Now* first is the knowledge and spiritual contemplation of what love is, possible through the glorification of the love of God in the Son of man, through that type which shines so brightly before us—*As I have loved you!* As no other son of man could say—God is glorified in me; so no man could say, before and apart from Christ,—Love as I have loved! in its full and perfect meaning. But this type and exemplar is not merely living, but *makes alive;* and that is the kernel and centre of the *newness* of the new covenant and commandment. In this —*As I!* we have the *first table* of the New Testament decalogue, out of which alone the second is deduced and fulfilled—the open and full realisation of that which in the Old Testament is only very dimly intimated in the added motive which accompanies the isolated precepts—כִּי אֲנִי יְהוָה, with at furthest אֱלֹהֶיךָ appended. The love of Christ awakens in us, brings and imparts to us, the love of gratitude in return, which then, as He needs us not Himself, turns to our brethren as He would have it. The first perfect fulfilment of the law in Christ, man like ourselves, stands *before us* as a living decalogue; but to our faith power comes from it *into ourselves* to love in like manner. (Eph. v. 1, 2.) That is, as Kölbing says, "the *new foundation* of the commandments, the union of His disciples with the Lord through His blood." The precept to bear our brothers' burdens in love (to wash their feet), is called in Gal. vi. 2, the *law of Christ,* first, because Christ did Himself bear all our burdens,

[1] To this pointed v. Meyer's note, given previously—Yea, the *sole* commandment.

then, because He requires the same of His disciples, and requires it because they *can* fulfil it. Here we must protest against the almost universal assumption of the expositors that the ἵνα in the second clause is to be transposed and to be construed properly before καθώς. We know that elsewhere ἵνα stands thus for ὅτι, especially after a οὗτος, αὕτη, τοῦτο (comp. ch. xvii. 2, 3); and the words *might* literally run—ἐντολὴν ταύτην, ὅτι ἀγαπᾶτε, once more, ὅτι καθὼς ἐγὼ καὶ ὑμεῖς κ.τ.λ.[1] But the *matter* which is here spoken of teaches us that actually in this unjustifiably overlooked and invalidated ἵνα we have the kernel and key of the whole, the inmost and most essential καινότης πνεύματος καὶ οὐ παλαιότης γράμματος. Luther's translation "*auf dass*" is perfectly right, the restitution of which I unhappily failed to plead for. Christ hath loved us—*so that* and *in order that* we *may have power* to love likewise. (See the same ἵνα, Rom. vi. 4, where the amended translation has markedly put *mögen* instead of *sollen*). Let it not be said, as Alford affirms in opposition to me, that the second ἵνα is parallel with the first and to be explained by it; rather must the first be explained by the second; and the δίδωμι, in the New Testament spirit, should have this full meaning,—Here it is an ἐντολή of what *should be* simply that is spoken of, but the Lord *gives* His living and life-giving commandment to His own, *as* He gives His peace and His Spirit—as the *Father gave to Him* the ἐντολή of His doctrine, life, and death.

The precept of the *old covenant*, although it signifies the same love, stands nevertheless and continues to stand on tables of stone, in the Torah; to fulfil it, at least as perfectly as through the Spirit of Christ, remains an impossibility. Certainly it is so in the natural heart of the *old man*—there stands the love-commandment miserably *reversed* in selfishness, Every man must love me![2] And the Old Testament, the expression of which the Lord repeated in the Sermon on the Mount can at first only point *condemningly* to this pattern; it can only demand the reversal of natural self-love into the now supernatural *self-denial*—but not produce it. For, apart from grace, that is a fearful truth which even Hezel remarks upon our text—"To nothing

[1] As modern translations simply give it, So love—so should ye also love.

[2] Compare our observations at the Sermon on the Mount, vol. i.

is man more inclined than to hatred of man!" It is true that there was genuine love in the Old Testament, but not created by its law. There were before Christ, there are now apparently out of Christ, Samaritans, who practise mercy, but only through prevenient hidden grace in Christ. And where Christ is preached, there first is all love made perfect by His Spirit; while all so-called love, which will not accept but declines Him, must be reduced to a *lie*. As Nitzsch preaches, "At this point we must cry to the Spirit of truth that He convince the world and the spirit of the age of its glorification of love in connection with a contempt of faith. What, is love to be exalted alone, and faith to become a thing of nought? Just because so very much, yea, everything depends at last upon love, on that very account we should lay great stress upon the genuine and pure teaching of evangelical faith, and make very much, yea everything, depend upon the unmutilated truth of redemption and of grace in Christ in all its unimpaired and perfect revelation of the grace and love of God in Christ." Even as he lays out the plan of his excellent sermon:—"In communion the great essential is brotherly love; in brotherly love, if it is to flourish perfectly, the great essential is the Lord's discipleship."[1] *When the darkness is past and the true light now shineth, then* is the ἐντολὴ a καινὴ, that is, an ἀληθὲς ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν. (1 Jno. ii. 8.) There have we the authentic interpretation of the Evangelist himself! Then have we passed from death unto life

[1] Schonaich, das neue Gebot des Evangeliums, Magdeb. 1846, has set in an excellent light this passage as it has been perverted by the German Catholics. He gently reminds these erring ones that "they are building without laying a foundation; that they seek fruit without planting the tree." And its conclusion testifies, "We will never agree with the melancholy fancy that nothing depends upon faith, but will evermore assert that this is the root and living fountain of love." In the denial of faith as the foundation the error lies, and not in the interchanging and confounding brotherly love and universal love! To this applies what Kahnis has well said (vom. h. Geiste i. 5): "Though the Lord makes love the distinguishing note of His disciples, it does not follow that Christianity consists only in love. The measure of subjective appropriation is not the measure of the thing itself. A man very eminent in the learning of this world wrote to a pious Christian lady the commonplace remark that—to him Christianity was love; she replied, Yes, but according to St John's word in his Epistle, 1 Jno. iv. 10.

(ch. iii. 14). Therefore is it God's commandment that we *believe* on the name of His Son Jesus Christ, and *love* one another, as He *gave* it to us in His commandment (ch. iii. 23). There have we the unity of faith and love, the growing of love out of faith! "No man is in a condition truly in the Spirit of Christ to love his neighbour as himself (we would add—and in the truth of the old commandment, from the beginning) unless he loves *like Christ*." (Lücke.) And no man, again, can attain to this unless as a disciple of Christ he hath *received* His Spirit.

Thus the *new type and exemplar* with its *new power* is the fundamental point in the newness. But as we at first, when referring to that subject, admitted something of newness in the simplicity of the word which enjoins it, so we may now supplement all by adding—This word *becomes to us abidingly new* as a superaboundingly exciting principle, convincing us of an obligation never discharged but ever in force (Rom. xiii. 8), a universal ἐντολή prompting to eternally new duty, reigning over that boundless domain—εἴ τις ἑτέρα ἐντολή. But this *last* view of it, which can be understood only when the others are understood, must not be made, with Olshausen, the only meaning of the ἐντολὴν καινήν: to do so is strange folly, to be accounted for only by the expositor's confusion of ideas in the interpretation of the whole passage.

Ver. 35. In this following verse our whole exposition finds its full justification and completion. So much of obligation and of absolute condition remains in this evangelical precept, that whosoever does *not* fulfil it is thereby necessarily excluded from the covenant of grace. In test, consequently, and warning, the Lord now marks out the *boundaries* of discipleship, just as the Sermon on the Mount pointed its close, though here more graciously in the positive form of expression. But while He speaks in the positive form, the rigid negation must be heard as the undertone,—If ye should *not* have this love, it would be thereby evident that ye are *not* My disciples. This is involved in the critical ἐάν. In this one thing and in no other is discipleship approved. It is not *knowledge* which avails, not a *so-called faith*, even though like that of Judas, before the devil entered him, it could cast out devils and remove mountains; rather is this knowledge and this genuine faith known by this love. As

little avails the *confession* of My name, or of all the truth concerning My person and My kingdom. Where this walking in the truth is not found, the confession becomes an all the more frightful lie. Where Christians are disputing over the holy places, in the presence of Turks and Heathens, to the reproach of their Lord, contending whether Latins or Greeks are His true disciples—when the Formula Concordiæ is made an apple of discord among brethren—the world may well ask what their Master has taught or done for them. As the disciples of the Pharisees were known by their phylacteries, and as the disciples of John were known by their fasting, and every school by its shibboleth—the mark of the disciples of Christ is to be *love.* And that a genuine love, as Christ loveth; not that merely which (as Schonaich represents) says to a neighbour—Thy joy is my joy, thy pain is my pain—which, indeed, is a great thing, and not to be found in reality in the world—but that which recognises and aims at the salvation of a neighbour, his true good; which makes the joy of the sinner its grief, and his divinely mourning sorrow its joy, and says, *Thy salvation is my joy, thy destruction is my grief!* It is still possible for the world to *recognise* at least this love, through the Spirit of Christ who accompanies and bears witness to His grace. Love itself is not to be seen with the eyes, but the light of its good works is (Matt. v. 16); and it is a well-grounded presupposition that *all men* in the world know enough about love to discern and distinguish generally that which approves itself as genuine by active endeavours for the good and salvation of others.

Let it be observed, further, that the Lord here says generally *μαθηταί*, for primarily and essentially the Apostles, like all others, are simple disciples. Thus does He significantly enlarge the circle for which He speaks, beholding in these eleven His whole people hereafter to be called, whom the covenant and the commandment concern:—the *ἀλλήλους* and *ἐν ἀλλήλοις* is said to all future *μαθηταῖς*, including with all who at any time exist those who are to follow them. And now comes in the *γνώσονται πάντες* in its widest extensiveness! *What* are all these, whose knowledge the Lord here foresees and promises, to discern in us? That we love one another warmly and intensely within our own narrow circle, but care nothing for *them* as they are

without and not brethren, or even love them *less?* How *can* they be certainly and convincingly assured of our love, otherwise than by finding it going out also towards *themselves?* Thus we have manifestly once more the presupposed and included universal love within the brotherly love! For *why* and *to what end* are those without, so far as they can and will perceive it, to note and learn from us what true discipleship is? "Why is the Lord so solicitous that His disciples should be discerned and known of every man? For their own reputation in the eyes of man? But not merely, on the other hand, that they may be persecuted and hated, while they are *acknowledged.* No, they are to be recognisable and make themselves known, in order that others may be taught to believe in the Father of glory and the Redeemer, and glorify Him who has given unto men such power to love. *Thus it follows of itself,* that in loving one another, *they only exercise and prepare themselves for the exercise of a love which is to go beyond into all the world*" (Nitzsch). The others should thereby learn to believe and love, to become disciples, because they have been themselves loved as future and possible disciples. Let ch. xvii. 20, 21, 26 be compared and searchingly examined, for it essentially belongs to our present subject. In order that Christ's disciples may be able to love the world with a united love, we say once more with Nitzsch, "their love must have a household hearth on which its fire may be nourished, in which it may first condense its vigour."[1] This is our Lord's teaching—"but no exclusiveness as it regards those who are to be disciples, though now unrecognised as such."

Finally, the πάντες, closely investigated, does not refer merely and solely to those without; but the general expression, connected with what precedes and follows, intimates likewise that in *every* respect ἐν τούτῳ alone is the γνώρισμα of the μαθηταί to be found. Among themselves, also, are they to be known and approved by this; every man must know solely from this that he himself is in Christ (1 Jno. ii. 5);—yea, lastly, as Matt. vii. 16–23 indicates by what marks the Lord will in the last day know His own, so we are to interpret this passage too.

[1] Compare also his Prakt. Theologie i. S. 248, where the distinctive obligations of brotherly love have also justice done to them.

And it is to this that the unusual ἐμοὶ μαθηταί (as mei or mihi) seems to point:—In My sight and judgment, or to My honour (as ch. xv. 8), so that I may be able to acknowledge you.

THE FIRST INTIMATION OF PETER'S DENIAL.

Ch. xiii. 36, 38 [Luke xxii. 34].)

This pre-intimation of Peter's denial is manifestly not the same with that second which Matt. xxvi. 34 and Mark xiv. 30 record as given after the setting out, *on the way to Gethsemane;* but St John's narrative may be harmonised with that of St Luke. It may be regarded as strange that Peter should the second time be so presumptuous as to enforce from the Lord a second prediction of his denial—but we have a parallel in the twofold indication of the traitor, and the evangelical records cannot otherwise be understood. For our part, we think it better to accept such *repetitions*, which are not the less perfectly reconcilable because they are such, than with the *identifying* Harmony to deal loosely with the most definite statements of time and connection.

Here in St John Peter has almost overlooked the great word concerning love, into which John himself profoundly sunk, because his rash curiosity is still busy with the ὑπάγειν of ver. 33. He thinks of *that* alone, and reverts to it in his question. This is a point of connection which has its historical value; and it is not necessarily a different one from that of Lu. xxii., since the Lord's words there introduced, ver. 31, 32, without any immediate connecting clause, may well be regarded as interjected between. St John is generally, as we know, more exact in his systematic treatment than St Luke; and he shows us here how that the Lord was induced, after the dogmatic word for the apprehension of faith, vers. 31–33, and the ethical word for the love of the heart, vers. 34, 35, to add yet a *third* word—in opposition to the presumptuous *curiosity* of the head and the heart, for the casting down of all the precipitancy of nature. The open and hasty Peter, who shows himself always as he is—*in that* being also a Nathanael—is the representative, in this

chapter of general significance, of that impetuous curiosity which springs from a lack of self-knowledge and self-communion:—that twofold evil which first takes the form of a misdirected questioning as to the Whither, and then of the bold self-confidence which merely follows it. The true inquiry and investigation, as the Lord teaches it, goes into one's own heart —Lord, is it I? *What am I?* He who pretermits or passes lightly over this, comes easily to *pass over* and forget, as if it were the *old* long-known word, Jesus' *new commandment* of love. Instead of perceiving *in this* the true way of following Christ for himself,—a way simple and plain, though to his high-minded and self-seeking nature so difficult and steep,—his desire is fixed solely upon this, to ask, out of what might appear to be a feeling of love, more about the Lord's *ποῦ* and *ποῖ* than He sees good to reveal.

Ver. 36. The answer gives at first, referring it especially to Peter, only a repetition of the declaration in ver. 33, which must stand. But for its closer explanation the previous overlooked *ἄρτι* is placed more prominently in its true position:—I have said to you all, and especially to thee, *for the present*, that ye *cannot* yet, *νῦν*, at this time, follow Me. The fault and the deficiency thus lies with the disciples, who are not yet mature and capable of dying with their Lord the self-renouncing death of love unto heavenly glorification. Indeed, they were all called to follow Him in their time, essentially by a very gradual increase of His life in themselves, but also in their own peculiar vocation to a similar self-sacrifice in martyrdom. Therefore, the *νῦν* is at once explained and complemented by an antithetical *ὕστερον*, parallel with the *μετὰ ταῦτα* of ver. 7, though manifestly with a more distant and wider meaning now. Peter is once more pointed to a *future experience*, to a *following under the Cross*. This following is for Peter especially the *death of martyrdom* ordained for him, as chap. xxi. 18, 19 proves; but it is at the same time for him as for all the whole internal experience of spiritual life, the *death of self-renunciation* which embraces the whole external process of life. The former has ever in the latter its root and its reality. Therewith perfectly coincides the general reference to his future experience, to his future apostolical power after the *ἐπιστρέφειν*, Lu. xxii. 32. As long as Peter

still tarries in rash curiosity he does not receive all this instruction; but afterwards, deeply humbled by his fall, he finds in that promise of his faithful Lord—*ἀκολουθήσεις μοι*, a *word of consolation* which establishes him again, as v. Gerlach well observes.

Peter, however, for the time overlooks all this, because his proud heart cannot yet *understand* it; he still occupies himself with the altogether too repugnant *οὐ δύνασαι*. He will not receive this saying, even from his Master and Lord, who knows assuredly much better than himself. He thinks that he knows himself; the forwardness of the *heart*, which properly lies at the foundation of that of the head, breaks out now in his not merely asking again *why*, but adding his strong protestations likewise. The second clause thus gives the first a deeper meaning: I cannot understand this, I know otherwise—*wherefore should I not be able?* Thus he utters his *Δύναμαι* like the sons of Zebedee their *Δυνάμεθα*, Matt. xx. 22. We see that he is still the same, after the Supper, as he was at the feet-washing.

Ver. 38. Mournfully, convictingly, and yet graciously does the Lord now address to him the testing question, uttered this time in vain, in which his *θήσω* is literally thrown back to him. With such a *θήσω*, such a *ἕτοιμὸς εἰμι* (Lu. xxii. 33), all is far from being done! Augustine cries out, Quid festinas, Petre? Nondum te suo spiritu solidavit Petra. First must *the Lord for thee lay down His life*, then comes the time of following Him. Dräseke well expresses the universal meaning which underlies this, and to which we have referred before,—"I will lay down my life for Thee—*in this he hit the very point*, expressing it sharply, definitely, and with a compass and force never before reached. Well, is the Lord's reply (at least this is in the great question by which He responds to the question of the disciple), *that is everything*. Nothing less than *the being able to lay down life for My sake* will avail if you would follow Me through this world. He who does not take up his cross and so follow Me, is not worthy of Me. *But—Hast thou reached this point?*"—If we may unite the records, it might be here that our Lord continued, after this question:—Simon, Simon, bethink thyself who thou art, and how it stands with you all—Satan hath desired to have you; and Peter more vigorously replied—With

thee, both into prison and to death—Lu. xxii. 34 here coinciding with Jno. xiii. 38.[1] As it regards the definite "deny Me *thrice*," and the significance of the *cock* crowing, we must defer what we have to say to the last part of our work, where, after having extracted what is peculiar to St John, we shall return to a comprehensive exposition. Let it be remarked only, that here *οὐ μὴ ἀλέκτωρ φωνήσει* is to be strictly referred to *this* night (introduced at ver. 30); and, therefore, that this must be the night between Thursday and Friday, since otherwise many crowings would have intervened. The *twice* crowing of Mark xiv. 30 will find its explanation in the sequel

FAREWELL DISCOURSES OF JESUS TO HIS DISCIPLES UNTIL HIS SETTING OUT.

(Ch. xiv. 1–31.)

Before we enter upon the detailed exposition of that inseparable whole which flows forth so richly and so profoundly between *μὴ ταρασσέσθω ἡ καρδία*, ch. xiv. 1, and *ἐγὼ νενίκηκα τὸν κόσμον*, ch. xvi. 33, it is necessary, or we may be allowed, to say some preparatory words about the sections, and turning-points, and fundamental thoughts which mark the progress of this marvellous current of discourse. For exegesis can scarcely begin its task before such adjustment of the main ideas is made. We find, indeed, in this section, which on that account admits of no comparison with any other in Scripture, a peculiar difficulty of analysis; Vinet, commencing in his last days a series of lectures upon it, found—"*a Divine confusion.*" For, what the departing Saviour here poured forth for future remembrance and glorification by the Spirit, remains still inexhaustible for our poor understandings, and far transcends the common laws of our so-called logical order of thought. Where the consolations, disclosures, predictions, and promises of the God-man for those

[1] It has been incorrectly said that Peter's denial was predicted by the Lord three times—here, in Luke, and in Matthew and Mark. But it appears more proper and more significant to say that *Peter* thrice protests against it.

whom He calls His friends, pulsate in the vibrations of His feeling (deeply-moved, but in the most serene self-consciousness), there the life is from moment to moment—one thing recurs ever in all, and yet every utterance is fresh, distinctive, and new. Thus the best advised course for the expositor is to enter and go through the whole discourse, as it proceeds sentence after sentence. But when he has done this, he may be allowed to gird and qualify himself for the proper business of an expositor, by unbiassed contemplation and observations upon the whole. In this spirit let the reader now mark what we have diffidently ventured to set forth.

It will appear undeniable that in ch. xiii. 31–35 we have, so to speak, the great theme of the following discourses marked out beforehand. We find here the three fundamental elements which pervade the whole:—the word concerning God's glorification in the Son for *faith*, the new commandment of *love*, the mysterious fore-announcement of *His departure*, who already taking His farewell requires faith and love, the Spirit for the full creation of which He goes to procure. Therefore we find interpenetrating these three fundamental thoughts, the perpetual *promise of the Comforter*, reference to His coming again with the light of truth, the life of love, the peace of victory.[1] It will appear, however, on a close investigation, that chs. xiv., xv., xvi., notwithstanding the constant recurrence of the same living thoughts which pulsate through them, do resolve themselves into *three corresponding masses*, which (though with some indistinctness between chs. xv. and xvi.) the present arrangement of the chapters represents. The *first* manifestly sets out from *faith* in God pre-eminently; the *second* relates especially to the *love* of those who are united with Him and through Him; the *third* comes in conclusively (we might say, for *hope*) with the most definite fore-announcement of all that which should result from, and follow upon, the *departure of Jesus*.[2] And now we may be permitted to point this out more closely.

[1] The accompaniment of *warning* is to be found only in one place, ch. xv. 2, 5, 6.

[2] With this almost entirely accords Baum.-Crusius' arrangement, unusually good for him:—"Ch. xiv. is spoken with more direct reference to the *consolation* of the disciples *immediately* after His departure; ch. xv. is

Thus, in ch. xiv., the Lord speaks *pre-eminently* concerning *faith* towards God and towards Himself, in the acknowledgment that the Father is in Him and He in the Father. (See vers. 1, 9, 10, 13, 20, 24.) Yet here we find that the Lord proceeds already from His own *departure*, that is, preparatorily for them to the Father; even as He anticipates the *love* in internal fellowship with Him, which exists in them as a germ through the weak beginning of their faith, but which was to be brought to its consummation through the influence of the *Comforter* to be obtained by His departure. Accordingly we find the same trichotomy underlying the whole:—

I. Faith in Him, who goes before through death into the Father's house,—that is, through death viewed in connection with its results, His heavenly exaltation and glorification.

1. Ye well *know whither I go!* (Vers. 1–4.) (although ye now cannot follow Me, as said before.)
2. Against the protesting interruption (ver. 5), the expression is changed: Not so much My death is *the way*, as rather, *I Myself* am the way, because the Father is in Me, and I am in the Father, because I thus dying *only go to the Father*, and again I *alone* (for you) can go to Him! (Vers. 6–10.) (Exposition of ch. xiii. 31, 32.)

II. *Love* in and out of faith, or the internal fellowship with the departing Lord, which begins with the faith now existing in them, but can be perfectly wrought only by the *Comforter*, whom He will send in His own place, in whom He Himself (with the Father) will come back to them.

1. First comes an *excitement of faith* through the sublime promise of *greater works* (vers. 11, 12), and perfect *answer of prayer* (vers. 13, 14).
2. *Then* the keeping of all His commandments in the one commandment of *love*. Here again,
   a. First, the preparatory word embracing them all in one.
   b. Then, the reference to the *Comforter* (prayed for by Himself) who will bring the new life, uniting them with Him

more *hortatory*, with respect to their continuous brotherly fellowship; ch. xvi. is more *warning* in its character, for *distant futurity*." But we would say, instead of *warning* for the last (not its main character!), more *comprehensive* and conclusive.

and the Father—and that, *because* faith and love are already in them (differently from the world), and also *to the end that* both may be made perfect in them. (Vers. 16–21.) Conclusion: I will manifest Myself!

c. The interjected question (ver. 22) concerning this difference between them and the world leads to a more direct explanation, which conditions the receiving of the Spirit (who will guide the knowledge of faith into all the truth) upon the *loving* obedience to His words. (Vers. 22–24.) (Exposition of what we found in ch. xiii. 34, 35.)

III. Returning back to the beginning, and now more plainly: —The Lord's *departure*, in which He

1. *Promises* in His prediction *peace*, or leaves it for His *farewell.* (Vers. 25–27.)
2. But, properly (speaking by anticipation for their future joy and their future faith), He *obtains* it by overcoming the prince of this world. (Vers. 28–31.) Here there is a first conclusion and setting forth in the *Let us go hence* —but this is again delayed, for the stream of discourse begins again to flow more deeply, and with still more fulness from His heart. He cannot yet leave His own, He has yet so much to say unto them.

Ch. xv. 1 down to ch. xvi. 4 treats, therefore, specifically of the *bond of love* between Him and them, as also, in consequence, among themselves: see vers. 9, 10, 12, 13, 17. But this also (just as in ch. xiv. the *world* already appears, in which He *leaves* His disciples) is led back again, through the contrast with the *hatred of the world*, into the promise of the *Comforter* after His *departure.*

I. His disciples' *bond of love* in Him (not without reference to the ordained Sacrament):

1. In the *similitude* of the Vine and its branches, pointing to the fruit of holy life as to be borne *only* through union with Him. (Vers. 1–6.) (Hence there is an accompanying warning to those who simply abide not in Him!)
2. Exposition of this in unfigurative terms. (Vers. 7–17.) (Confirming our interpretation in ch. xiii., that our love comes only from His.)

II. The ἀγαπᾶτε ἀλλήλους directs His thought anew to the

hatred of the still *unbelieving* world, in which they must *follow* Him who loved, but was hated; so that this becomes a second *note of His disciples.*

1. The warning announcement—It will not, it cannot go better with you than with Me! (Vers. 18–20.)
2. The explanation arising out of this:—the inexcusable sin of *unbelief!* (Vers. 21–25.) (So that here too, in this intermediate section, *faith* is *per oppositum* spoken of still.)

III. But, for their encouragement and peace, the Lord returns to the promise of the *Comforter* after His own *departure.*

1. Ye shall (in My love despite all the enmity of the world) *testify of Me,* as having been Mine from the beginning, when the Comforter is come! (Vers. 26, 27.)
2. All this *I say unto you beforehand* (as guard against offence and apostasy) because *I go from you.* (Ch. xvi. 1–4.)

To this is now joined the final and distinctive *farewell discourse,* which ch. xvi. 5–33 embraces. Here is most plainly and decisively announced, although in repetition of what had been previously said,—*all that was to follow after and from His departure,* and in such a manner that all is seen to rest upon the fundamental distinction between the *unbelief* of the world and their *faith* through the operation of the Comforter. First comes the definite *Νῦν ὑπάγω,* ver. 5, with the consolatory assurance that only in consequence of that the Comforter can come. (Vers. 6, 7.) The process of the discourse which follows is mainly directed to the *future,* but returns at the close to the present.

I. *The work and office of the Comforter,* when He shall come.

1. To the *unbelieving world,* vers. 8–11 (in which a direction to righteousness in Jesus follows necessarily upon the correction of its unbelief; and then also the escaping of judgment, through faith).
2. *To His disciples,* that they in faith may know all the truth, may understand the words of Jesus, that *He in them* (as the Father in Him) *may be glorified!* vers. 12–15. (Intenser expression for ch. xiii. 31, yet only the full explanation of what is involved there.)

II. The *great change from sorrow to joy* following *immediately* upon His departure,—as it awaits His first disciples, but only

as the type of all future disciples during the entire period between His departure and return.[1]

1. The wholesome *sorrow* (upon their being reduced to their own weakness and feeling their own sinfulness), which is turned into joy, and has for its fruit the true birth of the new man. (Vers. 16–21.)
2. Then and thenceforward increasing, and at the *last* goal of His *return* (of which the first return is once more only a type)—in that day full and perfect *joy!* (Vers. 22–24.)

III. *Concluding reference to the future*, final promise and comment upon all these farewell discourses:—My present discourse, even the plainest, remains uncomprehended by you for a while, as in proverbs, because your *faith* is not yet discerning and confirmed, and your love (with all its sincerity) is not yet strong and stedfast.

1. *In the future* ye shall plainly know (and, indeed, immediately the Father's love!)—because ye do yet *love* Me and *believe* in Me to some extent. (Vers. 25–28.)
2. *At present* I can acknowledge and confirm your faith (which ye avow, as ye think, with full understanding, together with the love which it testifies); yet only in connection with a lamenting glance at your weakness, which will be seen when the hour comes which is already come. (Vers. 31, 32.) (Here we have preparatorily the true meaning of the ἄρτι πιστεύετε, which coincides with ch. xiv. 1.)
3. Here, finally, *the Lord abruptly breaks off* with a *last word of consolation* concerning peace and *His overcoming the world*, ver. 33, a word which rises gloriously above all the weakness of His present and future disciples. And this θαρσεῖτε, νενίκηκα, anticipated through His confidence and in His love, can be followed by nothing else than the prayer of victory offered up in their hearing and before their eyes.

[1] Yet the sorrow of the first disciples (to anticipate our special exegesis) is based upon their still existing unbelief, which must become manifest; and is thus parallel with that Divine mourning by means of which the previously disciplining Comforter wins other disciples from the world.

FAITH IN GOD AND IN JESUS. HIS GOING BEFORE INTO THE FATHER'S HOUSE: HIMSELF THE WAY: THE FATHER IN HIM AS HE IN THE FATHER.

(Ch. xiv. 1–10.)

The clause which was probably interpolated for ecclesiastical reading—*καὶ εἶπε τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ*, did not belong to St John's original text, which makes the discourse of our Lord to the collective disciples flow on continuously after the pre-intimation of the denial. The pressure of time and of His emotion would not allow the intervening pause to be of long duration.—"The humbled Peter is speechless"—but the Lord, whose purpose is to re-establish and console, begins now first to utter what was in His meaning and upon His heart when that forwardness had again interrupted Him. It was His design to speak of the *ὅπου ὑπάγω*, and, in connection with that, of the faith which should behold the glory of God in Him, of the love which should be begotten by His love. Thus He now gives a further answer to the *ποῦ ὑπάγεις*—yea, a superabounding answer to all the questions which then or thenceforward the heart and mind of His disciples might put forth, far beyond what either they or ourselves may ever understand. "He has here richly poured out all that high heartfelt *consolation* which Christianity has in it, or which man, in all his needs and troubles, can desire. Further, we have here the great articles of Christian doctrine in most impressive exhibition, fundamentally established as in hardly another place of Scripture:—the three undivided persons of the Trinity; the person of the Lord Christ in His human and His Divine nature, one and eternally inseparable; also the righteousness of faith, and the true comfort of man's conscience."[1]

Ver. 1. We read earlier concerning the Lord Himself, *ἐνεβριμήσατο τῷ πνεύματι—ἐταράχθη τῷ πνεύματι—ἡ ψυχή μου τετάρακται*. The *ταράσσεσθαι* of the *καρδία* here is not

[1] Luther's Vorrede zu seiner Auslegung von ch. xiv.–xvii. which "testimony to the glory of Jesus Christ" has been very seasonably re-edited by Hermes, Magdeburgh, 1846.

so deep as the first, but more than the second; this last word is found in prophetical reference to the sufferings of Christ, but could not be used in the more exact phraseology of the New Testament concerning Him. (Matt. xi. 29 is the only passage in the Evangelists which speaks of the καρδία of Jesus.) The Redeemer, now standing after the departure of the traitor in a prolepsis of His glorification, and thereby armed for His conflict, knows now not merely the distress which is in His disciples' hearts, but the anguish and perplexity which would shortly seize them:—His gracious μὴ ταρασσέσθω, spoken for the future, embraces both. They are now confounded and amazed by His words concerning His going away (ch. xvi. 6), and concerning the betrayal of one and the denial of another of His disciples; yea, the institution of the Supper, which should hereafter be their chiefest consolation, but the "for you" of which did not as yet find pure believing hearts, adds to their grief. And how often both to them and all future disciples would fear return to the heart, induced by all kinds of causes—the feeling of sin excited by the law, of weakness by the gospel, the conflicts and ways of trial in which they find themselves alone, down to the terror of death at the last hour! But against all this, *faith* is the armour and the consolation, nothing but faith, and therefore the Lord speaks alone of that. Luther says, "This is certain and can never fail; if a man is in trouble and his heart is weak and terrified, that comes not of Christ: for He is not the Man who would terrify His people's hearts, or make them mourn." He adds what saves this from being misunderstood, "For if Christ troubles any one for his repentance and conversion from a sinful life—that is not for long. He does not mean that thou shouldst continue in sorrow, but soon leads thee into His comfort again."

Have we then here in the redoubled πιστεύετε which was spoken for their consolation, an indicative or an imperative, or both? From the very beginning different views have been held upon this question. Luther not only translates two indicatives, following the Vulg. (and probably Chrys.), but bound the second with the first as its consequence:—Ye believe in God (ye already believe certainly in God, now), ye therefore also believe in Me! This is assuredly incorrect, for such faith in Jesus

as He meant was wanting to the disciples; and, moreover, the deduction of this faith from a general faith in God, as something already existing in consequence, is *here* at least out of place. Assuredly, it must essentially so follow, and if the faith in God (Mark xi. 22) is perfect, it is enough, and includes necessarily faith in the final and full revelation of God in Christ. For, all faith in God derived from an old covenant, finds Him only in Christ as *our* God—even as the same God directly reveals Himself to the heathens through Christ, according to that already-quoted conclusion of the great heathen in Christendom, John Paul, who on the threshold of truth says, "were there no God and no Providence, Christ were He." In as far as any man (like the same John Paul) denies his faith to the Christ come and preached, he is wanting also in true faith in God.[1] He who can reject Christ is fallen from God; but he who believes in Christ believes now first rightly in Him who sent Christ; consequently it would be right to say—Believe in Me, and then ye believe in God! But on that very account the Saviour could not attribute to His disciples *now* a perfect πιστεύειν εἰς τὸν θεόν; or prove to them from that that they sufficiently believed already in Himself. "The Saviour foresaw that men would be disposed to stand upon this, that faith in God was sufficient unto salvation: He therefore added—Believe in Me!" (Gossner.)

This not only refutes the view of Luther's translation, which torn from its connection is liable to sad perversion, but also that intermediate view, which Luther strangely substituted in his exposition,—that the first *believe* is indicative, the second imperative. So Erasmus and Beza; so Glassius and Grotius: *sicut* in Deum creditis, sic in Me quoque credite! (For which sicut *subaudiendum* the latter very inappropriately compares ver. 19 and ch. v. 17, while the former thinks that in the second πιστεύειν a verbum de continuatione rei significatæ intelligendum: Creditis in Deum, et in me credite, h. e. pergite credere.)

[1] "Many men *imagine* they can believe in God without being obliged to believe in Jesus. I have never met with a man who did. (That is, in Christendom, and rightly understood.) There are *liars* enough who say—I believe in God and have no need of Jesus." Hamburgher Friedensboten, Jahrg. 1821. S. 355. Yea, verily, for how can he who believeth not in Him whom he hath seen, believe on Him whom he hath not seen?

So also, unhappily, it stands in the London Hebrew N. T. מַאֲמִינִים—הַאֲמִינוּ. For this Olshausen also decides, "ye believe in God, therefore believe also in Me!" The possibility of such a meaning lies in the truth that the disciples did indeed believe already in God, and that the Saviour demanded of them that they should gather up all their Israelite faith towards God into a faith also in Himself. But did they not already in an imperfect sense believe also in Jesus? As He cannot recognise this latter as insufficient by a second indicative,[1] so He cannot use the first πιστεύειν in a less emphatic meaning than the second. Not *merely* were they to gather up their already existing faith in God, but they were to *consummate* it first by faith in Christ. Suffice it, that even for the meaning which would make Him *appeal* to all that they yet had of faith in God and Jesus, a *redoubled positive imperative* is alone suitable,—being opposed to the previous negative, "only an affirmative application of the Imp. μὴ ταρασσέσθω" (as Brückner says), just as in the analogous, Be not afraid, only believe! So the Peschito, the body of the Greeks, Augustin, Hilary, Lampe, Lücke, and, generally, most expositors, even when they do not fully understand the deep significance of this expression. For the Lord is in truth not speaking here merely of the faith of these first disciples in the hour of trial, but He lays down the word for all the future of His entire discipleship, as a testimony that only through faith in Him can a full faith in God be attained and consummated, in the sense of the apostolical teaching, 1 Pet. i. 21. Klee: "Trust in God is the flower of faith in Him," with which agrees the truth, on the other hand, that a certain trust in God must previously be the bud of faith in Him. The juxtaposition of the designedly redoubled πιστεύειν, and the prominence of the καὶ εἰς ἐμέ coming first, has much meaning. On the one hand, to wit, the already existing faith in God must be the *ground* of faith in Christ; but again, on the other hand, the *perfect* faith in God is to be the *result* of faith in Christ:—

[1] Bengel, agreeing with our previous summary, makes the ἄρτι πιστεύετε of ch. xvi. 31 the finally attained goal, as an indicative answering to the imperative of the outset. He proposes to point, πιστεύετε· εἰς τὸν θεὸν καὶ εἰς ἐμὲ πιστεύετε—but himself withdraws this as needless and overstrained.

therefore can the first be only imperative.[1] The co-ordinate expression alone was suitable to embrace both sides of the matter; its *καί* must first be taken as inferential of the latter, and then more profoundly as giving the reason and ground of the former. This invalidates Olshausen's objection: "besides which, faith in Christ is never added to and put by *the side* of faith in God, but the object of faith is God *in* Christ." Is not ch. xvii. 3 a quite similar *in addition to?* Taken as mere *And* and *With* (as a veil of the deeper connection, which the twofold and yet single faith, however, recognises), the *καί* rather in both cases must have the great meaning which has been acknowledged by all true exegesis—that Christ by *πιστεύειν εἰς* is made one with God. Luther: "Here thou seest plainly that Christ Himself testifies that He is equal with God Almighty; because we must believe in Him even as we believe in God. If He were not true God with the Father, this faith would be false and idolatrous." In fact, that Christians and theologians can contest and deny the Divinity of the Son of man, asserting it to be a dogma which goes beyond the Scripture, while they read the Gospel of St John—is to be accounted for only by the blindness of unbelief, which, with all its talk about Scripture and scriptural doctrine, is no other than a deep-rooted unbelief in the immediate truth of the Scripture about which it speaks.[2]

Finally, that our contemplation may include all, let it be observed that He who makes Himself in these words equal with God, speaks at the same time *as the Son of man, with faith in Himself*, as the one champion and predecessor in the faith which He consummated in His death. "If a heroic spirit cries to us—Fear not! that is more than if one of ourselves, himself terrified, should cry to you—let not your heart be afraid! Know then that Jesus himself, the great Hero and Conqueror, cries

[1] Olshausen's proposal to take the imperative first and then the indicative—"Believe in God, and then will ye also believe in Me," is *partial.* This is true and involved in the meaning; but where then would be the appeal to an already *existing* faith? Does this word of *encouragement* tell the disciples that they have not believed in God at all?

[2] "Jesus excites them to a future fearless faith in Him as absent, *just as they believe in God.* They had much better than the Divine manifestations to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob." Oetinger.

to His disciples and to us this word of encouragement: He *forbids* to you all dismay; He declares it to be quite needless. Ye should do something better than fear." (Zeller.) This μὴ ταρασσέσθω of the πρόδρομος in the presence of His own dying agony was to resound in the ears of His disciples in all their future troubles; for "He speaks thus beforehand, both that He may tell them beforehand of their coming fear, and comfort them while He does so; that they may remember and console themselves with His words." (Luther.) This fundamental character of the whole farewell discourse, spoken beforehand for coming sorrow, is in connection with these first words too often forgotten, because they are attached too closely to the disciples' present case.

Vers. 2, 3. The Synoptics record the leaving desolate of the house of God (now—*your* house) upon earth; and St John now supplements them by an undimmed glance into the upper and heavenly house. For what other than heaven, whence He came from the Father and *whither He returneth* to the Father, can here be called His *house?* In John ii. 16 the earthly house was spoken of, which was to be destroyed; now opens to us the heavenly, in which *the Son* abideth ever, even while He is passing through the valley of death. Compare what we said upon chap. viii. 35, a slight reference to which may here be observed. House is home, where one abides, to which he belongs, in which he has a right: still more—it is a firm, secure building, provided for all kinds of need. It is a "heaven" in the sense of the phraseology of the blessed, as certainly as Christ speaks of it and goes to it—"the archetypal Zion and the archetypal temple" of the most essential presence of God with His people. Whether or not we may call the whole creation, consequently also the earth, the house of God in another sense, that is not here intended—as the analogy with Ps. xxiii., the entire usage of Scripture, and the further discourse here, show. Thus, it is a very incorrect exposition of the μοναὶ πολλαί (and only found among expositors *minorum gentium)*, to say, "The whole world is the house of God. In this great house is *not merely the little dwelling of earth*, but there are many other, better, and higher dwellings."[1] Oh no, that which the Son,

[1] Brandt: "He would comfort His disciples upon His going away, by

who as the only begotten knows all about His Father's house *above*, speaks concerning the many mansions, is quite otherwise to be understood,—though to the hard of understanding it has always been very difficult.

Before all it must be held fast—though often overlooked—that the expression *μοναί* is not altogether the same with the *τόπος*, afterwards, in the *μοναῖς*, but rather still closely belongs to the *οἰκία*. Lampe: Non tam designat locum, quam statum ipsum modumque habitationis. (This is somewhat inexact, but it is a presentiment of the truth: non solum locum, sed imprimis habitationis, mansionis modum statumque.) In ver. 23 also it has the emphasis of an *abiding* residence. Where abide we then, if Thou departing leavest us in this unfriendly world? It is to this anxious question of His disciples' hearts that the Lord now replies. *Μοναί*, mansions, or Bleibstätten (as the Berlenb. Bible translates) indicates assuredly the household character of the abodes, a state of rest in the Father's house.[1] But why have we *πολλαί*—? To interpret—There is room enough there for more than Myself! is to omit the full emphasis of the plural, besides instituting an unseemly parity between the Lord and His disciples. So also with Fikenscher—"I and the Father would not dwell there alone!" though Euthymius grazes the edge of this sense—*ἱκαναὶ δέξασθαι καὶ ὑμᾶς συνεσομένους ἡμῖν ἀεί*. This may, indeed, be elevated to the dignity of the great evangelical promise, that there shall never be any separation between our Lord and ourselves, that He will make us partakers of all;—but His "sitting at the right hand" is and must ever be something very different from a *μονή* in company with many others. This thought, that the Father's *house* is a house for many, lies indeed as a transition in the words, but rather in the previous *οἰκία*, certainly not in the *πολλαί*. Further, the general view that there is much room there, Luke xiv.

representing the world as a house, one chamber of which He now left to go into another, while He would be with them in the same house!" This misinterpretation, which unnerves the whole passage, has often presented itself to us in the pages of superficial expositors.

[1] It does not affect the question, that, as Lampe shows in his learned note, *μονή* in the *later* Greek is interchangeable with *σταθμός*, as mansio for statio.

22,[1] does not satisfy the sense, on account of the strongly emphatic plural. Hence it means not merely that many, already saved, are there—for that would give rise to the important question whether before the death of Christ any had really gone into the Father's house. Nor, "where *many* blessed have and shall find their eternal *abiding place*." (Herschb. Bibel.) For although this expression does justice to the word *μονή* (compare 1 Macc. vii. 38, *μὴ δῷς αὐτοῖς μονήν*—"suffer them not to continue any longer"), that is, in contrast with the earth (for the earth is not, as the Correspondenzblatt said, *one μονή* of the *οἰκία*), yet the *μοναὶ πολλαί* intends to say more than the *μονὴ πολλῶν*: there is assuredly involved a *manifoldness* in this portioning out of the dwelling. This appears in the fact itself, that in the great house his *τόπος* becomes to every one his particular *οἰκία* (comp. 2 Cor. v. 1)—but when we consider the analogy of the variety of life upon earth, something corresponding to which must be found above, and the hints which Scripture gives us of degrees and distinctions in blessedness, we cannot avoid the conviction that the Lord, speaking from living knowledge, is constrained to intimate this truth here. Tholuck decided concisely that this enters not into the connection; but yet he himself preaches, indeed almost beyond the truth, of the variety of conditions which awaits us on our first leaving this life, of the intermediate state wherein not yet all tears are wiped away, of a period of growth and increase in mansions of the Father—not all of which certainly can belong to this passage. Tertullian: Quomodo multæ mansiones apud Patrem, si non pro varietate meritorum? Quomodo et stella distabit in gloriâ, nisi pro diversitate radiorum? So Theodoret in Cant. i. there are *ἀξιωμάτων διαφοραί*—not otherwise Chrysos., Theophyl., Clem. Alex., Basil., Gregor. Naz., Hilary, and others. This superabundant mysterious declaration would make the impression upon the disciples, that everything in Jesus' well-known Father-house was well arranged and cared for. We have no-

[1] Luther was content with this: "If the devil, with his earthly tyrants, drive you out of the world, ye shall find room enough to abide above." So concerning the manifold gain of houses, etc., Matt. xix. 29, "If ye have nothing here, ye shall have abundance there. For God has such endless store that He can give to every one of you a hundred mansions for one."

thing to do with the modern extra-biblical, or Swedenborgian notions of the distribution of souls in various planets and fixed stars; the Oberlin tables and plans of these mansions we dismiss—whatever of truth may lie at the bottom of them all.

But now let us proceed to the difficult and much-contested following clause! The construction and punctuation, common from antiquity, which made the sentence with πορεύομαι dependent upon εἶπον, seems to be authenticated by the intervening ὅτι. This, indeed, might even then be differently understood; but we regard the ὅτι recitativum, explaining that the matter of εἶπον follows, as being a gloss. If the εἰ δὲ μή is referred, as is undoubtedly the sole course, to the immediately preceding clause —If it were not so (οὕτως ἦν or μοναὶ πολλαὶ ἦσαν), there arises the sense approved by Luther after Euthym. and Erasmus, and which satisfies many:—*If* the mansions were not there already, I would or I should *tell* you, I go to prepare places for you!" This Luther flatteringly presents in his exposition, "that I would prepare and appoint them, *although they exist already*, so that ye need not care or doubt about your abiding place. In fine, abiding places ye shall assuredly have; if there were not already enough, I would see to it that there be plenty provided; so that, if your hundred for one were too little, I would give you a hundred thousand." And this is regarded as "His speaking in child-like simplicity, accommodating Himself to their thoughts." But if we were not satisfied with that interpretation of the μοναὶ πολλαί, containing, as these words do, so distinctive and profound a thought, so we cannot reconcile ourselves to this further view of the whole—and we have many on our side. The strongest reason against it is, that the *going away and preparing places* would then be made hypothetical and an accommodation[1]—while the same ἑτοιμάσαι is immediately afterwards resumed in the ἑτοιμάσω with all the reality of the actual ἐάν, and, as we shall presently see, has its own actual truth. Therefore the construction holds its place which puts the stop at εἶπον ἂν ὑμῖν: this, after Laur. Valla, was defended by Calvin, Beza, Grotius, and approved by Knapp, Tholuck,

[1] Bengel, after the analogy of ch. xvi. 26, understands it as if it was—I did not say unto you that I was about to prepare a place for you, *since there are already* mansions, and many of them!

Olshausen, and Lücke. Then we have a confirmation or assurance, almost like a *verily I say unto you*, but following instead of preceding: "If it were not so, I would have told you, or would now tell you." Calvin: nollem vos frustrari. This is actually His simple, Trust only in My word! I say unto you what is true and real. If it *were* not so, I would *say*, It is not so! Vain consolation and empty forms of speech ye have never received from Me!

This very acceptable meaning De Wette (though he concurs with it) calls "a rather artless assertion of the truth," while Lampe rejected it at once as a *sensus elumbis!* La Roche declares that so far from child-like simplicity being its characteristic, this meaning is so tame that no similar example can be found in the whole course of the Gospels; in fact, that it would give us an *idle phrase*. He would therefore, what critical feeling never allowed before, supply πιστεύετε after εἰ δὲ μή, and then with the ancients connect *I go* with εἶπον—but in such a manner as to take away the hypothetical element. If your faith has been unequal hitherto to appropriate the fact that there are many mansions, and ye cannot now receive it simply, then *I now tell you*, and take My more special assurance—I go even now, to prepare places for you. This exposition was soon afterwards (S. u. K. 1831. 1) refuted by Beck. The carrying on of the πιστεύετε over a whole intervening clause is very harsh, the matter being different in the adduced ver. 11; similarly, the ἄν connected with εἶπον will not allow it to be a definite announcement, as La Roche felt when he called this "a difficulty." Thus far we agree with Beck. But we must maintain, in opposition to him, the simple propriety of the assurance of Jesus—If it were otherwise with the question than He had just said—He would have told them. This turn is not more strange fundamentally than His frequent verily, verily; and even in this discourse we find in ver. 11 the same εἰ δὲ μὴ πιστεύετε, which La Roche forgot to bring into comparison on *this* side of the question. Just *because* "He had even now required the all-embracing *faith* to be exercised in Himself equally as in God"—that is, *desiderates* it still among His disciples, follows now quite naturally the humbling though condescending reference to His own word, against all their mistrust—*Believe* Me only in what *I*

say! Beck and Lange (like Mosheim and Ernesti) prefer making it a *question:*—If it were otherwise, would I *have told you* (Lange, however,—*tell* you) that I go away to prepare places for you?—but this seems to us to involve the doubting of His words which is thought so repulsive, even more than the other. (So may we delude ourselves, in bringing forward novel interpretations!). Beck's assumption, lastly, that Jesus might have earlier said something about preparing a place, probably in a first answer to Peter's question, ch. xiii. 36, is a very bold one, but is altogether irreconcilable with the plain record of St John, ch. xiii. 36. Every unbiassed reader must feel constrained to believe that Jesus speaks this great word for the first time here, and in the right place. So that we may regard the former clause as settled, and turn to the next.

The going before and preparing is, as we have said, an earnest and necessary reality, by no means rendered needless by the εἶναι of the many mansions. The preparing is assuredly not merely—"to adorn them more gloriously, and thus prepare them"—for the τόπος is expressly declared to be the object of the preparing. First of all, the house above is *His* Father's house[1]—and consequently He alone has free entrance there, not so ourselves. If, moreover, these dwelling-places are regarded as having been in existence, empty and expectant μοναί, in the eternal purpose of God or since the Creation, yet He alone could *introduce* the elect, and make for them a τόπος therein, that is, give them right of entrance and possession. The τόπος in itself, too, already exists, as in ver. 2 it stands before ὑμῖν, but the reversed position in ver. 3 ὑμῖν τόπον lays (according to Bengel) the emphasis upon this, that it must be now *prepared*, opened up to us. In this we may rest, without more deeply investigating what else may have been effected in this regard by the entrance of Jesus into heaven. Suffice it that the preparing a place *for us* was necessary, according to the whole analogy of scriptural teaching. The shrinking of our heart from the *whither* of the *going away* has its good ground;

[1] On which Bengel remarks that the Lord in the beginning of these discourses speaks most of *His* Father, and later (postquam suæ præ credentibus eminentia cavit et discipulos ad fidem excitavit) He speaks of *the* Father, both His and theirs.

but our Forerunner would take away our fear by the assurance that He, the Son, goes into *His* Father's house *for us.* The gracious figure attaches itself (as the gentler πορεύομαι now intimates) to the custom of providing an abiding place beforehand in travelling; but it has here a most profound and real meaning which goes far beyond this.

In the resumption of ver. 3 the ἐὰν is not a mere ὅταν, but indicates a convincing inference—*Only for that purpose* have I gone before, that I might return and take you to Myself. Mark well—to Myself, where I am, for My Father's house is also My house! But when does this return take place, which the Lord here as so often elsewhere indicates with his imminent ἔρχομαι? "The *resurrection* return it cannot be, for at this resurrection visit He had not yet gone. The *pentecostal* return it cannot be, for to the preparation of our places *our fitness* to enter upon and dwell in the prepared place necessarily belongs—nor did He then take His disciples to Himself, to be where He was. Nor is it the *coming to judgment*, for then the Lord cometh with thousands of His saints, and assuredly His Apostles among them. It is His coming to *fetch them home*, since the Lord, *at the death* of His disciples, and of all who believe in Him through their word, actually, though invisibly, returns again for them." (Zeller.) Of this apparently clear statement and distribution, all that we can appropriate is the correct fundamental idea, *that we also must first be prepared for the place;* for the rest, we think that in these sharp distinctions there is an undue forgetfulness of the profound fulness of meaning in this sacred saying, which embraces many things in one, especially of the *fulness of meaning in this promised coming again*, as it pervades the whole of chs. xiv.–xvi. Now at the beginning the Lord does not speak otherwise than He speaks afterwards, concerning His πάλιν ἔρχεσθαι; but there it takes in perspectively the whole series of the resurrection, pentecostal, home-fetching, and judicial coming again, as it was to develop itself by degrees into full consummation. He who does not seize and admit this, will be in our judgment altogether at a loss in the interpretation of this chapter, to which the general canon of the perspective in prophecy admits of full application. The predominant meaning resolves itself, indeed, into its various meanings by degrees; in ver. 18 we have mani-

festly the Easter return, as ver. 19 shows; and then in ver. 23 this coincides with the Pentecostal; in ch. xvi. 22, 23, it extends forward, *as will be seen*, actually to the last day for the collective discipleship; when the risen Lord came, that was already a certain quickening, a breathing-upon with the Holy Ghost; if the Spirit is received, then are we already spiritually translated into the heavenly nature, and are there where He is; on the return of Christ at the death of believers that is brought to perfection which to that end was prepared for by the operation of the Spirit in the case of the individual;[1] finally, the judicial return is, as being at the same time a redemption, such a consummation for the church at large, and consequently therein the first full perfection also for the individual. It is not quite true that (as Olshausen says) in *John* "the Redeemer embraces His subsequent relation to His disciples under two aspects, as an *external* departure, and as an *internal* spiritual return"—since this would necessarily require us to apply a perfectly different standard of doctrine to the exposition of St John and to that of the Synoptics. But as the view which regards the death of Christ as itself a going to the Father and a glorification, does not really exclude the resurrection and ascension, so also in the more spiritual apprehension of the coming again lie all the external unfoldings of the same down to the final manifestation. Why should we not understand the pregnant words of our Lord, as all His other discourses and revelations unfold them in their fulness of meaning? He promises here, as Nitzsch rightly preaches, "that He in the power of His love, drawing all to Himself, will in all time come near to every one of us, and return for the redemption of each disciple on his death-bed or in every time of severe pressure, even as *He will return to His whole Church* for its redemption at the end.[2]

His *coming again and receiving* embraces the whole of His

[1] He comes Himself to fetch us, as Lazarus was carried by angels only.

[2] Comp. Hofmann, Schriftbeweis i. 167 ff. Only that here the emphasis is too strongly laid upon the eschatological meaning, the reference to the individual being included only as a preliminary beginning. For our own part, we should not be inclined to press too much the distant and future element in this whole farewell discourse, but to take a middle course. The disciples were troubled, they were bereaved as individuals, and this gives its force to the ὑμῖν, ὑμᾶς, ὑμεῖς here.

influence, drawing, setting free (ch. xii. 32, viii. 35, 36), beginning with the resurrection and ending in His final manifestation; His entire work of *bringing home, preparing us for our place* after the place is first prepared. Only that it would be very incorrect to regard this *preparation of us* as itself the proper and only meaning of the manifestly distinctive ἑτοιμάσαι τόπον, as Augustin does, and (following him?) the Bible of Brandt—"Jesus prepared there where He went a place for the Apostles, *in that* He made them in this world by His Spirit, etc., meet for glory." For this undue preponderance of the spiritual and internal element in the interpretation would confound the going away with the return, the result of Christ's departure as obtaining for us the right and power of entrance with the fruit and harvest springing from it in ourselves.

Ver. 4. This, meanwhile, holds good not only of the first disciples, but in its comprehensive prophetic meaning of all future *followers of the Forerunner*, and of ourselves. This gives us, when we rightly understand the fundamental thought of what preceded, the explanation of what the Lord must mean by *the way*. It is not by any means spoken in precisely the same sense as in ver. 6;[1] the word is here closely connected with the foregoing, and we have afterwards (as often in our Lord's discourses) the more profound and concentrated re-interpretation of the same expression. First of all, it is in connection with ὅπου ὑπάγω the way which Himself *goes;* but then, in addition, the way in which He fetches home His disciples. We must, indeed, regard the latter as predominating, or rather as taking the lead, since to the ὅπου ἐγώ there corresponds, as it were, καὶ ὑμεῖς echoing from the former verse. After the Lord had promised to the disciples the preparation of their place, the obtaining of their citizen-rights in heaven, *He remands them as pilgrims who know the way*[2]—that is, their own way through His

[1] Not, as B.-Crusius,—"the way *must*, according to ver. 6, be Himself."

[2] As Nitzsch with a sound exposition preaches. The abbreviated reading —καὶ ὅπου [ἐγώ] ὑπάγω, οἴδατε τὴν ὁδόν, may indeed be genuine, though we would not with Luthardt unconditionally maintain it:—such conciseness scarcely corresponds with the gracious consolation of the whole discourse. It sprung probably from the redoubled οἴδατε, but is not this to be accounted for by the similarly redoubled expression of Thomas?

forerunning. Not merely the goal but the way, not merely the *whither* but the *how*. They have now the knowledge of the sure and certain way to their home, to His Father and their Father; they do not, they should not, contemplate merely as from afar the high and mysterious goal which the brightness of His words revealed, but it is brought home to them directly through His promised coming again. Ought not the Lord to be able after three years to say—If I go away, ye know *whither!* whither but to the Father (ch. xvi. 5, 28), to the great house above? Herder beautifully says, "the clearness and confidence with which Christ speaks here, makes, as it were, heaven and earth one." But, indeed, He condescendingly attributes to His disciples the same clearness and confidence, though *they* are far from possessing it. And *the way* for Me and for you, that we, after our separation, may be eternally together? This they should know, that *for Him* it is no other than *death*, glorifying and leading Him to the Father—and *for them?* No other than the *following Him unto death*,[1] in faith and in love waiting for Him, and depending upon Him. To embrace all this in its plain meaning was beyond their capacity; but yet the redoubled and emphatic οἴδατε has its truth. First, as Lampe remarks, interdum quis laudatur, ut officii sui moneatur; thus, ye *might* and ye *ought* to know this. Then, for the future—I have now told you, and ye shall soon understand it. Thus the Lord aims, as it were, to lift the disciples above themselves and their present understanding; irradiating them with His own light. "To suggest doubts to one another, and awaken anxieties, is easier, and has often the appearance of a greater earnestness and precaution against self-deception. To be able to encourage one another—Thou knowest the way, thou art in it! is a greater service, when it is performed in the Spirit." (Rieger.)

We might expect an objection here, especially from *Peter*. He had not been sent away, as many strangely suppose, to

[1] Luthardt opposes that He is not speaking here of their following Him, but of His fetching them home. But this springs from his dread of the spiritual fulness of interpretation: for in truth the following Him is *for us* the first and most essential way in which the Lord, coming back first of all in His Spirit, begins to fetch us home, and prepares us for the final reception to Himself.

account for his silence;[1] but ch. xiii. 38 gives us the sufficient reason of his stillness. Thomas, doubtful and morbid, slow of faith but internally full of love, takes up the word: what he says declares his love, which holds fast sorrow for the Lord's departure, but is very far from being secure enough in faith to apprehend the way of following Him and reunion with Him. Lord, I could not say that we, properly speaking, *know* that which Thou supposest us to know—tell it to us once more, expressly and more plainly! By the first clause he encouraged himself to go forward more boldly in a second; so that out of the becoming *question* (see afterwards ch. xvi. 15) an almost unbecoming objection springs. The δυνάμεθα εἰδέναι corresponds precisely with this characteristic of his word; and we would not sacrifice it, with Lachmann and Lücke, to the reading οἴδαμεν. A literally repeated οἴδαμεν in reply to Jesus' redoubled οἴδατε would be a somewhat too bold retort; but a certain *reason for* his contradiction is not at all inconsistent in the mouth of Thomas. He who does not know the goal, how *can* he know the way thither? Rieger deals sharply with poor Thomas: "Many mistakes come together here, which Jesus might have made to recoil upon him. He interrupts Christ; he contradicts Him, and, as it were, denies His truth; he says that they not only do not know, but *cannot* know; he does not speak of himself, but he judges and involves others, saying *We;*—all which was immodest and presumptuous enough." He applies this, however, appropriately afterwards: "But the words of confounded, perplexed, sorrowful men must not be retorted upon them as arrows. His meaning was not so bad as his words. Christ bears with him, and yet vindicates the right. He knows that they did know, *although they did not altogether know that they knew.* Yes, in truth, because an amazed and self-dishonouring heart spoke it, the Lord gives a gracious answer—Lovest thou Me not, then, Thomas? Dost thou not hold to Me, to go with Me and die? Behold, there thou hast *already the way*—for I can say to thee more expressly and plainly, *I am Myself the way!*" Let us

[1] *E. g.* Richter's Hausbibel: Peter and John had been sent away to provide the passover. We cannot believe that Peter and *John* through any case would have failed to hear all these words. Is not John an ear-witness here?

observe (after Meyer's note on ver. 22) the indiscreet questions and interruptions of the disciples throughout these chapters, and mark how the Lord's answers, while they are indirect, are sufficient, and uninterruptedly carry on meanwhile His discourse.

Luthardt (i. 135, 136) rightly observes that all this ignorance and misunderstanding of the disciples rested upon the fact, that the character of Christ's life, and His departure especially, did not appear to them to harmonise with the Old Testament. But when the question of Judas in particular (ver. 22) is asserted *not* to have sprung from misunderstanding, but from a *right* apprehension of the Old Testament, we must maintain in opposition the very reverse.

When any one *in our own time*, after the word and the Spirit of Christ have long spoken to him, and the seal of His meaning has been long broken for all sincere souls, opposes his similar *οὐκ οἴδαμεν* and *πῶς δυνάμεθα εἰδέναι*—then becomes he the *unbelieving* Thomas in the worse sense, who *will* not know and believe; and to him a different answer would be appropriate, that of ver. 6 having been given in vain. But a genuine Thomas *asks for the way* in deep earnestness; and such trouble about not knowing will not long be without the consolation of a perfect understanding.

Ver. 6. We have seen already how emphatically and graciously the Lord by His *ἐγώ* brings Himself near to them as Himself their all. It is plain enough to us that the fundamental idea of the whole is the *way;* but the juxtaposition of the two other words is strangely misunderstood: preachers especially are too apt to take the three clauses distinctly,—Christ is the way, *and also* the truth, *and also* the life. This is not exegesis. It is rightly perceived that the two following words serve mainly for the explication of the first; but it is carrying this view beyond bounds to depress *the truth* and *the life* (to both of which the *I am* with equal emphasis belongs) into mere adjectives qualifying the way—as in Augustin's *vera via vitæ.* This is true, but touches only the superficies of the meaning. Beck's words do not full justice to Christ's saying, "He is, *as* the truth and the life, so also the way to both"—for the truth rather corresponds to the way, the life only to the goal, but the proper goal of the way must ever be the Father's

house—*to the Father!* Better would it be to say, The way, *because* He is the truth and the life; but this needs a more exact development. And at the outset we must not pass over what the superficial expositors obstinately omit to notice, that the Lord not merely shows or leads in the way, speaks the truth, and gives the life, but decisively says with regard to all three—*I am!* We might say preparatorily, though somewhat mystically,—He is as *man* the way which offers itself to all men —as *God* absolute, independent truth, actuality, essential being —as *Godman* the life, that is, the fountain of life, springing from Him and by us received, for His own. This life is ours in Him, that is the truth, but *before and in order to all* He assuredly is ever our way, into which we must come and walk through Him.[1]

As far as we yet understand this much-pondered saying, it *unfolds itself* in the following manner, and thus alone the organic development of the triune expression is preserved. First of all, in Christ is *the way*, that is, *the* way of which Thomas speaks (Lampe: via illa) and for which all sincerely anxious men inquire—the way to the *Father* and to the *Father's house.* This is the only right way concerning which it should be asked, the way simply, for it alone leads to the goal.[2] This is the holy way, so plainly now revealed that *they who walk* therein, though fools, shall not err. (Isa. xxxv. 8.) In connection with this explicit and fundamental truth the Lord thinks at once (and we also if we are sincere) of the many conflicting *ways of error*, which are devised of falsehood, and lead to destruction: therefore it follows, I am *the truth.* And that, as the personal *am* shows, and the following word confirms, the

[1] We must maintain that the Lord here utters the expression of ver. 6 in the most comprehensive meaning, bringing home to them the whole salvation which was in Him. The predominant eschatological point of view which we condemned in Hofmann, is to be observed also in Luthardt, who makes *this* word "in its direct exposition" hold only an *eschatological* meaning! "The transpositions, applications, and deductions which *men* have based upon this passage," are rather the work of the true *expositor* in the Church, the Holy Ghost. It is not the thought of the final future which reigns in this chapter, but that of the immediate return in the Spirit.

[2] Thus only one way, not "many posterns to the many mansions in heaven"—as the strange book of Julius, über die Hebung, etc., assures us.

truth in the highest sense, *living* and absolute, the truth and actuality *of the way*, as at the same time of the end. We might therefore say instead of this—He is the *entire, first and last reality* of all the ways of man's return to God and reunion with Him, because He is no other than the eternal *Λόγος* who has come down to us from above. (Thus there is included—the fulfilment of the Old Testament in the sense of ch. i. 17.) But the living truth is for us *life-giving*. As the way is and becomes to us truth, so this truth is and becomes *to us the life:* —*ζωή* is assuredly with its especial emphasis to be taken in this communicative sense. Our life is a death-life, which leads to death; yea it is itself spiritual death, without the life of God in us. (Chap. vi. 53.) But because He is the life in us and to us, He is not only still such *in death* (of which all here treats), but just through His death for us, through His going away and coming again, He becomes life to us. Thus, I am the way, that is now most internally—I as the Dying and yet Living. *The whole saying speaks of the mystery of the cross* of the Reconciliation, it cannot even approximately be understood out of this centre, taken out of this it rather becomes a perversion and itself a lie; for *merely* as a pattern or a teacher Christ is actually neither the way nor the truth *for us*, in *His* life He cannot *thus* become *our* life. As long as the first sanctuary stood, the way into the Holiest was not yet opened (Heb. ix. 8) —but now hath Jesus obtained entrance for us, *consecrated for us a new and living way*. (Heb. x. 20.) And *this* word of the Holy Ghost is actually no other than the supplemental and full interpretation of our Lord's word. The Lord, as the Forerunner and opener of the way, is Himself the way which opens itself unto us; which we have no longer to seek, but only to walk in it, as He says—*δι' ἐμοῦ*. As "we are wont to say of a way, that it *goes*, that it *leads*"—this figurative mode of popular expression has here its essential, literal truth. Rieger speaks artlessly but with profound propriety: "Who among us makes himself a path for others? What lowest menial in the land would be willing to consent if the prince commanded him to lay his body down as a bridge for him to pass over a ditch which he could not otherwise pass over? But what man finds it hard to do for his fellow, Jesus does for us all. He lays

Himself down as a way, etc., etc." In a better, and more scriptural figure—By His cross He becomes our ladder to heaven. That is His way for our sakes, our way through Him. "Apart from Him is the bye-way, error, and death."—*No man* cometh but by Him to the Father. Beginning, middle, end, all is He! But neither the life[1] nor the truth is the *beginning;* as Luther expounds, "He is called the way with regard to the beginning, the truth as respects the means and continuance, and also the life for the sake of the end. He is the first, the middle, and the last round of the ladder to heaven." With this it must be understood that all is in one; for could the way be without truth, the truth without (first following) life? Nevertheless, it remains firm that thou must before all things *begin* with Christ as the *way*—which this word designs to intimate, promising therewith continuance to the goal.[2] Thomas à Kempis (de Imit. Ch. iii. 56), after he has previously followed the customary juxtaposition of one after the other, returns back to the right: Si manseris in viâ meâ, cognosces veritatem, et veritas liberabit te, et apprehendes vitam aternam. Only beginning rightly, by joining thyself to Christ, and hanging upon Him as far as thou knowest Him, especially as He is exhibited to thee in His atoning sacrifice upon the cross, and in this truth and in this life thou shalt not fail to press forward into the full truth of life in all its depth of meaning. Thus it is not as B.-Crusius, with characteristic error, says—"Truth is the beginning, life (salvation) is the end of this way." Oh no, the Pilate-question, What is truth? even though not asked sceptically, but with a philosophical desire to know, has never yet led mortal man to the living truth, unless the fundamental question of the heart and conscience has underlain it—Where is my way, as a prodigal son, back to my Father's house?—Thou needest not to know beforehand and at once even the *ποῦ*

[1] As Klee strangely expounds.

[2] "Christ, in His reply to Thomas, reverses the relation of the thoughts—If they knew the way they would know the whither." (Neander.) "Thomas thought that he who knew not the goal could not know the way. But Jesus shows him that in spiritual things the converse law holds good." (Lange.) Nonnus' paraphrase originated in some such notion—*Ζωὴ, ἀληθείη τε, καὶ ὄρθιος εἰμὶ πορείη.* Just before the "way" had the more proper emphasis.

and the πῶς, about which Thomas or Nicodemus may ask:—only walk in the way, it will lead thee, and as the one way multitudes like thee, happily to the many mansions. Theremin responds to the Lord's saying spiritually and profoundly: "Yea, Thou art the goal, and Thou art also the way. So is a stream goal and way at once. I will bend my energies to go thither, where the stream pours itself into the sea, thither where the Son sits at the right hand of the Father. And to reach it I will commit myself to the stream which is my way; and not only a way which guides me, but a *way also which bears me.* Thus come I to Thee through Thyself, Thou guidest and bearest me at once."

Should we then be terrified before this gracious—*I am the way?* Affrighted at the cross and death of Christ, because it is essential that we also go *through Him to the Father*, in this way, that is in fellowship with His death? When even the superficial sense of the words encourages our weak faith—I am the truth and deceive you not! I am the life, and will bring you with Myself safe through your death! If that is not enough He warns and urges us by the last word—*no man* cometh unto the Father but by Me! Thus warningly and exclusively and peremptorily does His word close; but only that it may turn our thoughts to the blessed kernel of promise within—But through Me *every man* shall most assuredly *come* to the Father.

Finally: Does the Lord limit the coming through Him to the Father to those who know His name and have His word upon earth? Far from it! He does, indeed, exhibit Himself at the door of His Father's house as the only θύρα τοῦ πατρός: yet as even for us Christians the very first spark of life out of His fulness is already the beginning of eternal life; every livingly acknowledged truth of His word and nature already the beginning of a guidance unto all truth; the preparatory, sincere walking in His light already a leading to the cross;—so there is similarly, and going still further back, a demonstration of Christ among the heathens, and in natural man. The same saying, inasmuch as independently of a conscious knowledge of the personal Christ all is *not* mere bye-path, error, and death, conceals the assurance that—Wherever any one is in the way to the Father, I am that way! Wherever any one finds truth,

that truth is something of Mine and testifies of Me! For I am ever from age to age the life and the light of men. Every not absolutely false way leads to the truth, every real truth has life in itself, but all in Christ.

Ver. 7. Well *for us*, dear reader, that *we* belong to those who already see the Son, whose privilege it has long been to be able to see Him and know Him aright. The gracious proffer of the previous verse—"*I am here!* How can ye then still ask for the way?" does not simply now go on, but it is overpassed by the new thought—"*And the Father in Me!* How should I not be among you the way *to the* Father?" The same which was said in ch. viii. 19 to the Jews, recurs now for the disciples (comp. such another repetition in ver. 12, and so often, as already in ch. xiii. 33)—but instead of the οὐκ οἴδατε there, an οἴδατε has already preceded here, while there even follows a γινώσκετε and ἑωράκατε. As indeed the εἰ ἐγνώκειτε is more than the εἰ ᾔδειτε to the Jews. This doubting *if ye had known*, again, essentially modifies the attributed *knowing* and *seeing* which thereupon follows; as it becomes manifest in the directly contradicting words of Philip, that these words had not yet their full reality in the disciples. It has been much and needlessly disputed, how the Lord could attribute this to them—the ἀπάρτι, from henceforth, being entirely overlooked. This does *not* mean—Since ye have seen Me, since I have been with you; although this *might* and *ought to* have been the case, as is *there*, ver. 9, said to their shame. Here the ἀπάρτι, parallel with the *now* of ch. xiii. 31, and ch. xii. 31, refers certainly to the glorification of Jesus before them which was *from this time* beginning, though for the most part still future. Tertullian well translated—*Sed abhinc* nostis; and Lampe: idem est ac si dixisset: nunc incipitis cognoscere. Similarly, Lücke: "Christ speaks here *prophetically* in reference to the fact that the hour of glorification was already come. Even now, from this time ye know Him, yea, ye *see* Him. Ἑωράκατε may be referred to the Present" (that is, as begun in His last discourses) "without any harshness, as in ch. ix. 37."

So much greater was the difficulty then to the disciples, in whose name Philip comes forward as the second interpellator, to behold with their beclouded eyes the present glorification of the Father in the Son. Again in perfect perversion they seek a

God, and even a Father, *apart from* Him! But in the sincere and desiring simplicity of the ignorance yet blended with their knowledge; *not* like those liars whom the world, their sin, *sufficeth*, who therefore *need* neither Christ nor the Father, who only dispute about the way—who have already "their God." Far as the heavens from that mocking question—*Where is thy father?* (ch. viii. 19), the disciples here ask in longing, trusting earnestness—*Show us the Father!* Although it is here to be seen that the general aspect of *error* appears very similar in the malignant and in the simply weak; yea, certain fundamental root-errors must be found maintaining and repeating themselves even in the best, in all their knowledge, until the full enlightenment burst upon them—the knowledge of the *glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ.* (2 Cor. iv. 6.)[1] And that makes it necessary to discern rightly the physiognomy of error, to take forth the precious from the vile. (Jer. xv. 19 in the Heb.) "The presumptuous, overwise, childish, luxurious, blear-eyed understanding may cry, Show us! Show us! Prove! Prove! and call out the truth as to a field of war,"[2]—but this is very different from the cry of Philip, *Show us!* which, though it comes from ignorance, yet is the sincere cry of the affrighted and eager spirit. A comparison has been properly instituted with the bold desire of Moses to behold the unseen glory of God, Ex. xxxiii. 18. The error here is, the desiring to have "at a bound" as it were, a highest and last revelation (in all things impossible); but it is outweighed by the boldness of faith in the midst of this unbelief in the already given revelation, which indeed does not suffice because it is not yet sufficiently acknowledged and received. Yea, it is true that there is much wanting here as it respects the true connection between the πιστεύειν εἰς τὸν θεὸν καὶ εἰς Χριστόν; Philip "lets Christ sit there and speak, but cannot cleave simply to the Christ who is speaking to him; disregarding Him

[1] Roos has well shown how natural and not altogether erroneous was the sentiment of the disciples at that time: "They prayed, Our Father which art in heaven! But they saw Jesus walking upon earth, and lifting His eyes to His heavenly Father in prayer. By that they became habituated to think of the Father as dwelling in heaven, and of the Lord Jesus as moving on earth. Their apprehension herein was not erroneous, but imperfect."

[2] Kleuker, menschlicher Versuch u.s.w. S. 31.

he wanders away in his own imagination to the clouds—ah, that we could but see the Father as He sits there among His angels! (Luther.) Nevertheless, previous to the true "My Lord and my God" there was no greater honour given to Christ, or higher power ascribed to Him, than in this "*Lord show us*—the Father!" Besides which there is the inexpressible artlessness and fundamental truth (with all its error) of the confident "*And it sufficeth us*," which in itself furnishes an apt illustration of the difference between a superficial and a profound exposition. The superficial understands with Grotius: non ultra interrogando molesti tibi erimus! and even Gossner translates with perfect insipidity—So are we content! The profound finds in it the true presentiment of that highest goal for the aspirations of man's heart, created for God and satisfied only in the living knowledge of Him; the real though half unconscious expression of that great truth—*To see God is blessedness!*

Ver 9. We have said before that the Lord in this ἑωρακώς and ἑώρακε does not intend actually to attribute to the disciples that they *had* already seen and *known* the Father in Him, and thus demonstrate to them, against their palpable protest, that they had known what they nevertheless knew not, and had acquired that which they then nevertheless had not. He *charges* them, however, with this, and it is with lamentation, that it ought to have been so, and might have been so with them. The confidential vocative *Philip* is better referred to the first οὐκ ἔγνωκας, which personally touches the speaker; and then the following great truth comes forward as a *general* statement and answer to all. It is not only permissible, but of the highest use in the interpretation of this sublime and simple word, to translate with Luther—He that *seeth;* as Erasmus substituted *videt* for the *vidit* of the Vulgate. For the sense is no other than—When ye shall have (now soon) "*seen*" Me *aright.* It is not a physical seeing which is referred to, for the people generally had that. Comp. the θεωρῶν after the πιστεύων in ch. xii. 44, 45, from which the Lord here once again repeats His word. The same saying, however, in that passage referred still more to the spiritual seeing of knowledge (as in ch. vi. 40)—here the proper *seeing* is also included, as manifestly appears in μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰμι. Christ is not merely the revelation to man's knowledge of that

which may be known of God, in such a sense that he who knows Him in faith must still retain a desire to *see* Him for his full *satisfaction* (1 Cor. xiii. 12; 2 Cor. v. 7; 1 Pet. i. 8)—but as He is, being the Only-begotten, the image of the invisible God, the brightness of His glory and express image of His person, so also as God become man, He is *the visibility of the Invisible*, as far as and in such way as that *may be seen*. Even in the heavenly beholding in eternity there will be no showing of the Father out of and apart from Him. (1 Tim. vi. 16.) This is capable of deep "metaphysical" application; but it is enough that exegesis, in its stricter meaning, hands over this word in all its unimpaired integrity to speculative dogmatics.

How sayest thou then, Show us the Father?! "This was not a contention which the Saviour had with the Father," says Gossner (probably, as often, after Zinzendorf). Oh that our unintelligent Rationalism would bring all its hallucinations about the contests in theology between the Father and the Son, to the solution of this word of our Lord, rightly understood! The lamentation and the charge is now addressed more earnestly than ever to Christians—Have I been with you so long and do ye not know Me; have ye not yet seen Me aright, not yet seen the Father in Me! Alas, Christ and God are still divided and distinguished, and that not by open unbelievers alone: "just as Philip here does, who passes by Christ and seeks God in heaven." Yet must we ever bring back to our minds the great truth that, even because no man hath seen God, or can see Him, therefore the Only-begotten became man for us! Let us ask and seek for nothing more, beyond and independently of His manifestation, His word, and His Spirit! Let us accustom ourselves more and more profoundly to sink into the blessed mystery of our most holy faith; so that we may correct all transcendental vague thoughts about God by setting Christ at once before our eyes![1]

And here let it be once more noted at the outset, how all these

[1] Not as the painters of the Trinity childishly represented on the one side the Father as an old man, and apart from *Him*, on the other side, God the Son! "The Son is ever the visible face of the Father—rather could we see a man independently of or apart from his face, than we can see God independently of or apart from His Son, who is His face" (Zeller). Thus, dear official brethren, accustom yourselves not to the fatal "God and Christ"—but to the God apostolical *in Christ!*

farewell utterances, as heard by the then disciples, are poured out in *one great abounding prolepsis;* for He would, as it were, shed the glory of His revelation beforehand into those darkened hearts which must wait for the full enlightenment of the Holy Spirit. There is no other such contrast and conflict as that which here, at this final juncture, *love* resolves. He speaks ever as if He was already glorified before them, as if their seeing and knowing were self-understood; but they reach not the height of His words, and thus constrain Him more and more definitely to refer their consolation to the coming Spirit of truth. There is a blessed propriety in both. Another Philip may and should now with perfect propriety, with ever deepening urgency, cry—*Show me the Son,* O Thou Spirit who glorifiedst Him! And it is done even as we pray. In as far as we have the Spirit we not merely *see* the Son in whom the Father is, but we *have* Him, He is glorified *in us* and *we in Him.* (2 Cor. iii. 18.) Before this the flesh still recoils, but not the heart which has joyful experience; the impulse to know still asks, but only so as to receive the ever more fully sufficing answer from the seeing of *faith.*

Ver. 10. *Believest* thou then not, not yet, that I am in the Father and the Father in Me? See that this faith *sufficeth thee!*[1] See, *behold,* here is the true *showing!* That is ever the great counter-question in answer to the continuing Philip-word of Christendom. *Believest thou?* That is still the humbling question of the Lord, which rebukes the presumption of every aspiring Philip *in life,* as it is the consoling question which alleviates the sorrow of every downcast Martha *at the grave.* But the evidence for their conviction follows here, as so often before, from the *words* and *works*—and that *in their unity.* That they are to be taken absolutely in their unity is shown in the decisive sentence coming first in ver. 10; ver. 11 then condescends to their weakness by the preliminary separation which leads again to their union—*If* ye believe not My word, yet believe Me for the works' sake! In ver. 10 (with which chap. x. 30, 37, 38, may be compared) there is a parallage elliptica or "ellipsis re-

[1] Not as if Jesus now exchanged the indistinct and paradoxical ὁρᾷν for the plain πιστεύειν—an idea of de Wette's which Luthardt rightly condemns—but the faith in His words should lead to, and become, a beholding of His person in His works.

petitionis ex præcedenti et consequenti membro complexæ," so that the Lord means both at once—The words and works are not of Myself, the Father in Me speaketh and doeth them. They are in inseparable mutual influence one; His words *are* no other than works, and His works are speaking and testifying words.[1] Nevertheless, the *words* stand with propriety first and last, first as demanding faith even without the works, and last as the proper object of faith, to which the works have only led back. But the greatest of all, in which all others merge, the work of works, is the act of the redeeming *passion and death*, by which the Spirit was procured for the right understanding of the words. Even that the Father *doeth* in Him, although He as the Father doth not actually suffer and die for us.

THE GREATER WORKS; THE PRAYING AND LOVING; FELLOWSHIP WITH THE DEPARTED LORD THROUGH THE COMFORTER, IN WHOM HE AND THE FATHER HIMSELF COME; SEPARATION IN THIS FROM THE WORLD.

(Ch. xiv. 11–24.)

In the *second* section of this chapter, vers. 11–24, the transition is made, as frequently in these last discourses, from *believing* to *loving;* from *believing* primarily as the reliance and subjection of knowledge, to *loving* as *not merely* fruit and result of this faith, but rather as already the *living germ* of the true and living trust of the person on a person, as the *affiance of the heart*, and therefore the paying regard and observance to His words as commandments—the "keeping" them. He who does not perceive here *this most internal unity of faith and love*, as it is obviously to be found also in the Epistles of St John, he who does not, that is, discern here *that love which the Lord from the begin-*

[1] Schleiermacher: "For what kind of word would that be, which was not also a work? and that were a poor work which was not also a word." Zeller: "The works of Jesus are the rudiments by which we attain to faith in His wonderful and supreme Personality. If we were more like children, and took more time for the contemplation of His person and works, we should more easily attain to that faith."

ning requires and recognises, as the true faith of the heart, even in connection with much unbelief of the understanding, will never enter thoroughly into the true connection of these sayings.

Vers. 11–14 is therefore by no means a conclusion belonging to what precedes, but, although immediately deduced from that, forms actually the foundation and transition to what follows:—faith is in preparatory promise awakened, when the greater works than He had Himself done are connected with prayer in the name of Jesus. But *this* faith and prayer has its root—and *that* is the progress of thought—only in an already existing love, which preserves and maintains what is already given; this abiding bond of love, again, with the departed Lord will be first developed and perfected through the promised Paraclete, in whom the Lord returns, reveals Himself perfectly to His own, gives them full life, and separates them from the world.

Ver. 11. The strange reading, followed by the Vulg., which has *οὐ πιστεύετε* as a question, may be at once rejected. The *οὐ πιστεύεις* which was spoken in reply to Philip especially, is followed by a *πιστεύετε* addressed to the disciples generally, as in ver. 1, and resuming the general tenor of the discourse. But the Lord graciously condescends, induced by the unbelief in His unity with the Father which had been disclosed, from the *εἰς ἐμέ* down to the preparatory *ἐμοί*. This preliminary trust includes, indeed, the true and proper ground of all faith, into which the works alone should guide them; for faith in Christ is a trust in His person, which can be fully revealed only in His words, and is in His works revealed only in as far as these *speak*. It is a reception of testimony (ch. iii. 11); an acceptance and recognition of His *Ἀμὴν Ἀμήν*. Thus it goes back again to the *ῥήματα*, ver. 10—"*The discourse hangs so upon the person,* that he who believes for the sake of the words believes in the person which utters them" (Kling). That which in ch. x. 37, 38, and earlier ch. v. 36, was spoken to the unbelieving Jews, must here again be declared to the weak faith of the disciples, just as we all frequently need to hear it still. The *εἰ δὲ μή* pierces us still with never-ceasing conviction: who has not needed often to be referred to the *works* in order to his full acceptation of this or that word of our Lord's mouth? But it is not that the works could testify for themselves, and secure conviction apart from

their connection with every witness of the Person who performed them.[1] For if they were not the works of *Christ*, they would avail nothing;—so that de Wette is not right, "the works themselves *apart from the Person*." If it stood *τὰ αὐτὰ ἔργα*, then we might understand simply—for the sake of *these works themselves*, that is, the works of which ver. 10 had last spoken. But because the *αὐτά* stands second, it forms a kind of contrast of the works with the *words* (the works for themselves, without the word), that is, a hypothetical antithesis; although after ver. 10 there could be no proper opposition between them.

Ver. 12. The reference to the works previously wrought by Himself is now wonderfully strengthened and extended into a promise of a more abundant continuance of the same through His disciples after His departure. The "works of Christ" as a testimony before the world for faith cease not with His manifestation in the flesh; they rather become generalised and spiritualised in His disciples through whose agency He continues to work. This high prospect is opened up to the weak faith of the disciples, just as we are wont beforehand among ourselves to awaken and stimulate confidence by confident promises and assurances with respect to the future. So Moses (Ex. iii. 12) had a sign in the same sense; and *that* is the true and most direct connection between ver. 11 and 12 in our passage. The strong assurance is made more abundantly strong by the promise of even *greater* works to those who believe! It is important rightly to understand this, and, without impairing it, to hit the precise meaning of this relative word of our Lord. Frivolous explanations, such as that of Gerhard and Lampe, who make *greater* stand for *more*, that of Theophyl., who makes it a mere hyperbole, or that of others who separate the *greater* from the *works* (He will do *greater* things than such wonders), confute themselves. This last is opposed by the previous *τὰ ἔργα ἃ ἐγὼ ποιῶ*; and, in fact, *ἔργα* are not exclusively miracles.

We cannot but think of *miracles*, first of all; and we know that the promise, Mark xvi. 17, 18, was not fulfilled solely to the Apostles and first Christians, but is being fulfilled to this day. Many of the ancient expositors referred it to the more visibly

[1] So that it is an incorrect emphasis in Nonnus: *σοφοῖς πιστεύσατε μούνοις ἔργοις ἡμετέροισιν.*

striking, and so far greater, miracles of the Apostles (speaking in strange tongues, Peter's shadow, Paul's handkerchiefs, removing of mountains and trees); but this is a petty interpretation, inasmuch as it is in any case *insufficient* as a meaning worthy of Christ and appropriate to His discourse. We would not, indeed, express ourselves so strongly as Tholuck, who says that only an Apollonius of Tyana could have spoken of externally greater works; for the Lord Himself evidently mentions *μείζονα ἔργα* in Jno. v. 20 with the same reference:—and there is a real difference, *e.g.*, between the ordinary casting out of devils, which the disciples of the Pharisees also performed, and the "Lazarus, come forth!" spoken into a four days' grave in a manner which no Prophet or Apostle ever equalled. Hence we cannot prematurely with B.-Crusius say (and this is another artificial way of dealing with *μείζονα τούτων*) that the *works* here are not miracles, but *spiritual results* of a comprehensive kind, and that thus it is proved "how subordinate in St John's style of thinking external miracles were!"[1] But a truth lies, nevertheless, in this, that our Lord cannot mean these *alone* in so expressing Himself.[2] That believers should perform *the same* miracles, not excluding raising the dead, was directly said in the *first* clause; the *μείζονα* which now follows is a *paradox* which presses upon us an extension or deepening of the idea in the *ἔργα*. Were the miracles actually the sole works, in themselves decisive, which Christ performed? Assuredly not, and therefore they are not so with us. And when we think of the *resurrection* in His own power, the Jonah-sign which first seals all the rest, who can perform greater, or so great? And is not every miracle of the Apostles, however relatively greater in appearance, yet in reality less, in as far as it was performed in the name of Jesus alone, and not by their own power or holiness? Thus, although the *τούτων* embraces the miracles as still continuing, it means not merely these; and *μείζονα* added must indicate something different and distinctive for the *works* of every kind.

[1] Is this true of St John's style of thinking, which begins his gospel with miracles, ch. ii. 23, and ends it with them, ch. xx. 30? which records and makes prominent as testimony or fact, the *greatest* miracles, at Cana, in the case of the blind man, and at the grave of Lazarus?

[2] As Nonnus puts simply *θαύματα* for *ἔργα*.

Is it that "*visibly* great or greater works" are not intended, but the secret influence of good, and spiritual victory—internal works which, however despised of men, are great in the sight of God, who seeth the heart, and looks not so much at the outward act? This does not meet the case, since our Lord does actually speak of works by reason of which others believe, and since in this interpretation the "greater" becomes impossible, and altogether vanishes. It remains impossible that according to any meaning a believer in Christ should perform *of himself* any *greater works* than Christ; for Christ has simply finished *the work*, and all His deeds are alone and supreme by reason of His Person and His essential independent power. We are consequently driven, with many in all ages, to refer the *greater* to the *result;* and this is perfectly suitable, for—works will and must *have effect;* a wider, more energetic, and more successfully active working may in human language *on that account* be termed a greater. Luther: "Here I take the common understanding of this declaration, that for this reason greater works are said to be done by His Christians, because His Apostles and Christians *go further with their influence than He did*, and bring more to Him than He Himself did while bodily upon earth." Although ἃ ἐγὼ ποιῶ stands opposed first to the Future ποιήσει, the *Present* is significant as intimating that Christ does not Himself cease to work, but the disciples carry on and extend what He did, *because He continues to work in them* (as Aug., Euthym., and others remark on ποιῶ).

The following ὅτι gives the great explanation of the whole: *for* I go to the Father, to give to your prayer henceforth power from on high; what ye henceforth do I will do through you and in you (vers. 13, 14); thus in My seed the pleasure of the Lord will prosper (Isa. liii. 10). For this it is very important not to put a full stop between ver. 12 and ver. 13 (with Chrys., Theophyl., Eras., Beza, Storr, etc.), but to read on *uno tenore* (with Friesbach, Knapp, Schulz, Schott, Lachmann, and Tischendorf).[1] The clause, Because I go to the Father, would, if so closed with a period, and rigidly pressed, lead to the perverted idea that the disciples must now continue to work in the place of the Lord

[1] Grotius: hæc ita uno spiritu legenda sunt—πορεύομαι καὶ ποιήσω; profectus efficiam. Comp. also Cyril in Tholuck.

the still greater works, *because He Himself was no longer there!* Oh no, He goes, indeed, but He also remains, He comes again and dwells in them—thus comes the *harvest* of His own invisible *seed* bringing the greater results to light. Mark well, that only to him who believes on Himself such *greater works* are promised! There is, indeed, a certain truth in the expression of the Theosophist: "All capacities and capabilities which Christ exhibited, lie in every individual man"—and in Meyer's note: "By His departure they were even to be heightened for His believers, that is, their outward results and achievements." This really refers also to the power of working miracles, which even Christ, as the Son of man, had *through faith.*[1] But these capabilities especially for the *μείζονα τούτων*, are awakened and put in exercise only in those who believe in Christ, and attained only by prayer in His name.

He sowed, we reap—and the harvest is indeed *greater* than the seed. He bore the first conflict and triumphed unto victory, we manifest and extend that victory, which we ourselves partake of, in the rich blessing shed upon our activity. Therefore the Pentecost sermon of Peter converted more in one day than the Lord in three years; therefore the death of Stephen in peace and joy after the anguish of the Lord's death upon the cross, whom he sees in the opened heaven as at the Father's side; so that faith in the Lord's victory becomes also our victory to the overcoming of the world. Hence also in a thousand ways our individual works are greater as to appearance and result, because "the Lord humbly in His contest with the unbelief which called Him forth limited Himself in His wondrous energy, leaving the greater things to be done by His disciples in His name, when the time of ripeness for faith had come as the result of His own work." (Beck.) What a graciously attractive and lowly manner of speaking is this, on the part of the blessed Sower and Labourer, who Himself alone performs all: Ye, My reapers, will do greater things than I![2] Thus come the greater works, when,

[1] Not as Apollinaris, who pressed and perverted the Church's doctrine upon the unity of the Person of Christ, losing the proper humanity (Dorner S. 1025), and denies this: *Οὐ γὰρ πίστει τῇ εἰς πατέρα τὰ θαυμάσια Χριστὸς ἐργάζεται.*

[2] Lampe: Mixta sunt cum radiis majestatis humilitatis et *συγκατα-*

as Braune says, "the streams of Divine power from above are unrestrainedly poured into humanity in order to spiritual efficiency in a greater and more enlarged degree, so that His miracles in the flesh appear small." But not only so—In order to their performance of physical miracles more productive of spiritual results, in comparison of which His own spiritual energy, while He was laying in secret the foundation for theirs, will *appear* less efficient. That "ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμέ" appropriates this promise to every believer down to the end of time is self-understood; and where the bodily wonders fail, the greater are not wanting. The burning witness speaks indeed with new tongues; the contender with sin casts out serpents; he who is spiritually unhurt by Satan's power drinks deadly poison without harm; the converter of souls gives healing to the sick in a higher sense, and as a greater work.[1] Again, as Luther says: "If he performs such great wonders and works spiritually, *it follows that he also performs them as bodily*, as being at least a beginner and co-operator thereunto. For, whence comes it that Christians at the last day will rise from the dead? that all the deaf, blind, lame will lay aside their plagues, and their bodies, beautiful and sound, shine as the sun? Comes it not from this, that they were here upon earth by the words and ministers of God converted, made believers, baptized, and made one with Christ?"

Vers. 13, 14. I *go*—to death, indeed, but thereby *to the Father;* away from you, indeed, but thereby the more spiritually and effectually to unite Myself with you. I in heaven, ye upon earth—but ye already, *in faith towards God*, know the heaven-ladder of *prayer*. I have now told you—*Believe also in Me!* Do ye not then suppose, that I can be prayed unto also when I am exalted to the Divine power and glory? This would have been the most obvious and natural process of the thought, a right understanding of all that precedes would lead us to expect it, and it is actually involved in the word. But the Lord spares the weakness of the disciples the new and unheard of thought of

βάσεως ejus specimina, quod opus per Spiritum sanctum absolvendum quamvis certo respectu majus ei relinquat, et peccatorum vilissimorum operam in eo non respuat.

[1] See Gregory's beautiful passage in Lampe S. 130.

praying unto a glorified man, or to God in and through Him (ch. xvi. 24, hitherto as yet nothing!); thus He at first attaches His words to *their* hitherto notion and custom simply, as it respects *αἰτεῖν*, that is, *τὸν θεόν*. Has not the Father always heard Me? Have I not thus done My great works? Know ye thus in faith, and hold ye it fast even when I am no longer visibly before you—and now let your *faith in My person* become *prayer in My name!* The two are one; not merely does the second follow from the first, but it is rather itself the internal truth and assurance of this faith. He who does not pray to God believes not in God. Prayer is already the internal evidence of faith for ourselves, then the works are the external for others. As it respects the universal promise of being heard, and receiving *whatever* we may ask in faith, we refer to such passages as Mark xi. 24, and others like it: here we have only to do with the meaning of—*In the name of Jesus.* But the understanding of this great word develops itself progressively in deeper fulness. *First*, and according to human analogies, to ask anything *in* or *upon* the name of any one is equivalent to mentioning him in connection with it, *appealing to him.* But even in this the Divine dignity and authority of the Lord Jesus is involved; for whoso can like Him (in the Our Father, Matt. vii. 7) give to men, as it were, a *directory and warrant* to God, to be presented with certainty of being unconditionally and always honoured—must stand in inmost and most immediate fellowship with God. Quite different was the Old-Testament calling upon the *God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob;* it would have been blasphemous to think of calling upon God in the name of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; since it was not a promise given by Abraham, and which was valid with God, that lay at the foundation of this, but merely a promise given by God to Abraham. But when we call upon God as *the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ*, we find through the Son and in the Son access to the Father, in which we come to God directly through Him. As a *second* sense, which can be no other than one with the former, it consequently comes out that we pray in the *name*, that is, actually *in the person* of Christ, that is, as standing in His place, through His preparatory and intercessory supplication; as if He came in and with us, and Himself prayed what we ask. And this is no mere *as if*, rather

it is the essential truth of the matter. Thus we have liberty to enter into the holiest ἐν τῷ αἵματι Ἰησοῦ (Heb. x. 19)—"we come no more alone, as we are in ourselves, but we enter with the blood of Jesus, with the same by which He Himself first entered for us."[1] He Himself, His Spirit, it is which prays. We agree with Luthardt that this is the critical point of the whole thought; and he agrees with us in understanding, *thirdly*, that we pray no other than what is *according to His mind, thus in His interest, for His kingdom*, what, and as He bids us pray, authorises and impels us to supplicate. But, *fourthly* and lastly, although the Lord condescendingly adds merely ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου to the αἰτεῖν scil. τὸν θεόν; although it might not become His humility in the flesh, evermore seeking the Father's honour, to speak otherwise (to say, Call upon Me, and I will answer you);—yet will every man, who acts in faith according to His word, naturally come to *call* immediately upon the name of Him, who is with himself by the Spirit at the same time that He is above with the Father—yea, the former only because the latter. Thus the calling upon God in the person of Jesus is an infolded consequence. Indeed, the reading αἰτήσητέ με, ver. 14, and με αἰτήσητε, ver. 13, are false; and the version of Nonnus, "οὔνομα κικλήσκοντες ἐμόν" is premature; but it cannot by any means be established that the prayer of the disciples was to be directed exclusively to the Father. The first prayer after the ascension (Acts i. 24, comp. ch. vii. 58) is addressed to the Son, and the disciples were known as those who called upon His name. For this is decisive enough the clause which immediately follows, τοῦτο ποιήσω, not ποιήσει ὁ θεὸς or ὁ πατήρ; while in ver. 14 this is repeated with the strengthening ἐγώ.[2] That δώσει stands in ch. xvi. 23 of the *Father*, says nothing against this; for, in the unity of the Father and the Son, now one form is used and now the other; comp. also ch. xiv. 16, 26 with ch. xv. 26. He who seeth Me seeth the Father—He who prayeth to Me prayeth to the Father.

[1] As we have expounded it in our Hebräerbrief.

[2] Who is the I? I thought He would say, Whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in My name, He will do it. But He speaks of Himself for a testimony; and those are strange words for a man, to speak so loftily. For by these words He gives us plainly to understand that He Himself is the true Almighty God, equally with the Father. (Luther.)

The immediate prayer to the Son is the consummation of the way to the most firmly-believing, most internal prayer; but, because the truth on which this depends cannot be presupposed in every member of a general assembly, the church in her liturgical common prayer adheres (after the Lord's prayer) predominantly to the supplication addressed to the Father; although the Son is also addressed, in compliance with the honour of His prerogative, especially at festivals and eucharists. Let the next clause also be deeply pondered, as it modifies the statement and reconciles these truths, connecting supreme majesty with deep humility, and arguing the unity of the Father and the Son:—that *the Father* may be glorified *in the Son*. Assuredly not, with Erasmus, per filium, but after the meaning of ch. v. 23, Phil. ii. 10, 11, to be understood. "It is He who will do it, and He is therefore also to be prayed to; and to ask in the name of Jesus means to call upon *God* under this *name*—in brief, to pray to Jesus Himself. For, He says, that thereby the Father Himself will be honoured in the Son; that is, honoured of us by our prayer, and glorified through our being heard.—No prayer in the world can go immediately to the Father, even though it be addressed to God direct; all things go to Him and come from Him through the Son. But if we as Christians are fully conscious of this, we pray intelligently to the Father *through* Jesus Christ, and know at the same time that it is altogether the same whether in our address we mention the name of the Father or of the Son. To call upon the latter indicates a species of humility."[1] Instead of this last we would rather say that in its humility it evidences the most inward and confident urgency of prayer. Prayers to the Father are often vague and general, so that a Jew might join in them; the more of Christian urgency in prayer in the Holy Ghost there is, the more immediately does it go to the Son; and then first this prayer to the Son returns back into such address to the *Father*, through Him and in Him, as finds its fullest *truth*.

[1] See the important essay in Meyer's Blätter für höhere Wahrheit (iv. 166) on Prayer to the Redeemer—against the "unintelligible and irrational blasphemy of the words Jesulatry and Christolatry." As if it were an εἴδωλον to pray to Him, who is Himself the true God and eternal life! 1 Jno. v. 20, 21.

Ver. 15. This sentence has been in all times torn from its connection, and, in consequence, much misunderstood and perverted. But the connection in which it stands is *twofold* in its aspect: inasmuch as the *loving* of which the Lord here speaks is, according to the principles of all these discourses, twofold; consequently, also, the *keeping His commandments*. This first love to Him, now presupposed as present in His disciples, is the responding dependence of the heart which, as a faith in His love, and a thereby awakened germ of love in return, is already the principle of life in their faith, even in the case of an unbelieving Thomas. But the perfect life of love in order to obedience comes first through the promised Spirit. For both the present and the future this clause stands here in the midst as mediating and transitional. It pronounces clearly both the *goal* of true *prayer*, and the *ground* of true *faith*. After the ὅ, τι ἂν and the ἐάν τι the question arises—For *what* then may we and should we ask in His name? Without excluding any individual object, even the slightest, any external and earthly thing *needful* to us, it is plain at the same time that, if we ask for it in His name, it must be included in the one great interest of His kingdom for us or for others, it must coincide with the one sole desire and impulse of all prayer—that the Father may be glorified in us, as in the Son, so also through the Son. Consequently, for the honour of our own name we *cannot* pray, nor for gold and earthly good, nor for help in need merely as such. For the power to work miracles and remove mountains, only where the honour of His name requires them, or may be furthered by them. But the sincere disciple who has begun to love Christ, and would perfectly do His will, will before all and in all ask for an increase of love in order to its evidence in deed and truth—πρόσθες ἡμῖν ἀγάπην. (Lu. xvii. 5.) Thus the Lord shows us, in connection with what precedes, first of all the object and aim of true prayer, promises us in the way of prayer the very *works* which He requires of His own, and that, as we now see, first of all, as the works of obedience, the fulfilment of the law. The law is through Jesus made to us itself a Gospel. Though not according to the true reading τηρήσατε, yet according to the *sense* of this encouraging *imperative*, standing as it does amid promises, Lampe's remark is quite correct—Non ait

servate, sed *servabitis*. (Compare ver. 23.) Vers. 11, 12 were themselves spoken graciously for the elevation of their faith still weak; vers. 13, 14, followed with a still more gracious disclosure of all the fulness of God in His ποιήσω for the αἰτεῖν—and He will not now suddenly between the two affright His disciples by imposing commands in the legal sense. Misunderstanding may rationalistically expound and preach,—*But* all these promises avail only on the *condition* that ye (*already before*, of themselves?) keep My commandments! Far be it! The Lord does indeed exhibit Himself here as in ver. 1, and everywhere in His Divine majesty; speaks like Jehovah on Sinai with His τὰς ἐντολὰς τὰς ἐμάς, and grounds and sums up the keeping of them all in *love*, just as Ex. xx. 6.[1] But His love has now not only so won the love of the disciples that in this *loving Him*, as the *true principle of their faith*, a nearer relation to God has been established, and a mightier energy set loose in them than the Old Testament knew—but He will further have His commandments kept *from love to love*, while their love asks and receives in faith all that is yet wanting to their completeness of obedience. *His* commandments *are* at the same time promises: he who *keepeth* them, that is, first of all, who carries them into the prayer of faith, and faithfully holds them fast (vers. 21 and 23 afterwards)—he shall more and more fulfil them.[2] That assuredly "knowledge, ver. 17, is given only to love"—as Luthardt seeks to correct my previous remarks—yea, that a loving devotion of faith generally is alone the great decisive condition, vers. 22–24, and the ground of separation between His own and the world, will appear when we come to that passage. But this *love* already existing in us, which the Lord recognises graciously in His ἐάν, is not so the object of a "categorical imperative" that the Lord convicts us by it and impels us through it, but that *we* under its influence are to knock at the gate of heaven and receive grace for grace. Augustin's Da quod jubes et jube quod vis—is also expressed by Apollinaris: τὰ μὲν ὀφείλεται τῷ κυρίῳ παρ᾽ ἡμῶν, περὶ ὧν καὶ παραγγέλλει· τὰ δὲ αὐτὸς παρέχει, περὶ ὧν ἐπαγγέλλεται.

[1] We have remarked on this in Vol. ii.

[2] Berlen. Bibel: "So that we need not think: Alas! *Keep* My commandments!"

Ver. 16. The connection appears thus: This now so incredible future of the greater works which I will do through you when ye shall ask in My name; this future, at the same time, of perfect love to Me (comp. ver. 28)—will come, when that Other cometh after My departure, the Helper whom I will procure for you by My going away. New and glorious declaration! Excepting the prophetical hint, Matt. x. 20 (Mar. xiii. 11), Lu. xii. 12,[1] this is now the *first* direct solemn and plain word concerning their receiving the Holy Ghost. We read these familiar words lightly on, but with what astonishment were they first heard! Calmly pondering them, and without terror at heart, they must of themselves have been reminded of the original promise given by the baptizer with water of the baptism of the Holy Ghost. (Acts i. 5.) Similarly, the Lord Himself in Lu. xi. 13 had once pointed to the Holy Spirit as the true and best *gift* of the Father, which they might *pray for* with the fullest assurance of being heard. Nevertheless He does not go on to say—And pray the Father that He may give you; nor, in way of promise, Ye shall ask, etc.; although this was included for all future disciples after the Apostles, and even they remained in prayer and supplication before the day of Pentecost. (Acts i. 14.) For this alone would not have been sufficiently encouraging and consoling. But as He has promised their work as springing from His own, so now does His prayer precede theirs—opening Himself their way to the Father. This is the emphasis of the ἐγώ—and it is not αἰτήσω which is added, but ἐρωτήσω, on which Bengel rightly remarks—familiaris petendi modus. And the Future is not to be overlooked:—In another and altogether direct manner will I pray when I have gone to the Father; and for that purpose do I go. (Chap. xvi. 7.) Thus we have here already intimated the intercessory mediation of the Exalted Redeemer, when and before its fruit for us is spoken of. All is on the ground of pure promise out of His grace and gift; assuredly also, as we have seen, then first will come the perfect loving and full obedience in act. By no means merely that

[1] In the latter passage the strength and clearness of the expression may have been added *ex eventu*.

"the sending of the Holy Ghost is regarded as the rewarding consequence of keeping His commandments."

The doctrine of the Divinity and personality of the Holy Ghost, which in the first period of the history of Christian dogma was developed with little precision,[1] has its foundation here in the manifestly personal name παράκλητος, who is further by ἄλλος placed on a level with the Lord Himself; comp. ver. 26 and chap. xv. 26, xvi. 8, 13, 14, ἐκεῖνος. The distinctive meaning of this ἄλλος and ἐκεῖνος must hold its ground against all the wonder of Frommann and others that so much should be made of them; and they will prove that here at least St John's doctrine has no such "wavering and shifting character" as has been ascribed to it.[2] For, on the other hand, as has been urged in Polemics, the name Paraclete is not referred to as another, but when this Comforter comes, comes at the same time the Son and the Father: vers. 18–23. B.-Crusius speaks most pervertedly: "The Paraclete is no more described by John as personal in any other respect, but this is also without any proper personification—the *semblance* of a personal description (only the semblance?) is retained, inasmuch as He was to be *exhibited as* the representative of Christ!" Such Rationalism we may now cast behind us, with much other foolish babbling of a former time, such as that of Eichhorn: "παράκλητος signifies the *doctrine*" of Christ Himself and the enlarged understanding of this doctrine—against which Storr condescends to observe that then it would be strangely discordant that in chap. xvi. 13–15 such a diffuse proof is given that the doctrine should not be different from the doctrine! Even Hezel in his time let fall the confession that, "if we would rather abide by the letter and understand by the Spirit of truth the third person of the Trinity, etc." Yes, verily, the letter does so speak, and we must hold it fast; only that we would better understand the "third Person," than some of our unspeculative dogmatics. Christ is Himself in His person the one Paraclete; in part already with the disciples, in part afterwards more properly with the Father; and by His side with like personality stands the *other*. We have already in ver. 16

[1] See the description of his own age in Greg. Naz. Orat. 37.

[2] Compare in Lange Leben Jesu, iii. 712, 713.

more plainly the three acts of the three Persons: asking, giving, abiding. So it goes on, and if we had only these three chapters of St John, the trinitarian dogma would be incontrovertibly evinced from them alone.

But now let us more closely look at the meaning of the important and not in itself difficult word παράκλητος, which the Syr. and Vulg. as also the Pers. translation leave unaltered. We do not find the word, indeed, in the Sept.;[1] and in St John, apart from these discourses, only in John ii. 1. Its signification should be plain enough, being substantiated by the grammatical form of the word itself, by the invariable and sole demonstrable usage of the Greeks, by the perfectly corresponding Latin *advocatus*, and even by the transition of the word to the Jews: nevertheless, it has been misinterpreted (as, in the last note, Aqu. and Theodot. fall into the common confusion of the expression), as if it might be and must be equivalent to the active παρακλήτωρ, παρήγορος. Origen and most of the Greeks oppose the spirit of the language, and make it παραμυθητής; Euthymius, παραινετής; Jerome, Erasmus, etc., *Consolator*.[2] It is not to be denied that *comforting* and *encouragement* is involved in the office of the Holy Spirit, even as *teaching* is (see presently ver. 26); but the comprehensive and profound official name παράκλητος, which *includes* that meaning, coincides with *that* παρακαλεῖν only in appearance, and cannot possibly be taken for παρακλήτωρ. Least of all can it be merely *Teacher*, or *Reminder*, as Theodor. Mops. thought, as Lösner (obs. ex. Philone on John xvi. 16), Vollborth, Ernesti (Opus. phil. crit.) have endeavoured to establish philologically. We would ask, Is τροφός with its active meaning really a similar form to παράκλητος, and, Does the Lord here speak merely as a departing διδάσκαλος? If "encourager"—speaker *to*—suffices (in the New Testament use of παρακαλεῖν), where is the advocate—speaker *for*—of 1 John ii. 1? The passages of Philo do not prove what they are adduced for; and the οὐδενὶ παρακλήτῳ (de Mundi Opif. Tom.

[1] In Job xvi. 2 for מְנַחֲמִים it has rightly παρακαλήτωρ; but Aquila and Theodotion παράκλητος, and Symmachus παρηγορῶν.

[2] For παρακλητικός, *comforting* (Schol. ad Æschin. Prom. 379) does not by any means fall back upon the form παράκλητος.

i. pag. 5 ed. Mangey) is not just *nemine monente*. The פַּרְקְלִיטָא of the Chald. in Job xvi. 20 and xxxiii. 23 is used plainly in the sense of "intercessor, mediator, manager;" for, "interpreter or expounder" certainly has nothing to do with the *former* passage.

We must, with Knapp, who first established it, though without sufficiently developing its exegetical consequences, hold fast the usage of the Greeks and especially of the orators, which makes παράκλητος, corresponding to the Latin advocatus, a *counsel* called in, a *pleader*, an attorney, and more generally an *intercessor*, as, *e.g.*, in Diog. Laert. 4, 50. This approves itself here out of the context, as well as by the parallel expression in 1 Jno. ii. 1, which must have looked back to this passage; for wherever this companion Epistle refers to the gospel *we have an authentic exposition of the Evangelist.* If Christ is first the one παράκλητος, in whose place the other is promised, then must for both the same fundamental idea hold good; but Christ is (even upon earth, in the case of the fearful disciples as opposed to an opposing world, and still more in heaven with the Father) our Representative and Counsel, who speaks and acts for us, thus and thus alone being the Helper of all who call upon Him and receive Him. This (in the accompanying ἄλλον) is the point of connection, and the *reason* why the same expression is used likewise with regard to the Holy Ghost, being then for Him *expanded* into teaching and bringing to remembrance. For the *Rabbinical* usage see in Buxt. Lex. the passage Pirke Aboth c. 4, where פַּרְקְלִיט as intercessor stands in immediate antithesis with קָטֵיגוֹר (κατήγορος, Rev. xii. 10)[1]—and the gloss upon it: פַּרְקְלִיט הַמֵּלִיץ טוֹב עַל הָאָדָם לִמְלֶךְ est interpres bonus pro homine apud regem (magistratum)—comp. 1 Sam. xix. 4. Thus παράκλητος is advocatus, as Tertull. and August. say; but that not merely, as Grotius thinks, "Who vindicates their cause *with the world*"—but performing, in a deep and comprehensive sense, all that which a *Counsel* or *Representative*, being at the same time an *Adviser*, can perform for us. It is not plainly established that Luther followed merely the *Consolator*, for

[1] As this latter elsewhere with סַנֵּיגוֹר συνήγορος, see Buxt. and add R. Juda in libr. Musar 126. 2, and Schemoth Rabbah xviii. fol. 117, where Michael and Sammael are similarly opposed.

Scherz and Oberlin show that in the documents of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, "Tröster" meant Intercessor, Surety, Representative of an absent person. If he had translated "Beistand"[1] it would have been better, though that would again have needed explanation for the people; it is not needful to alter our translation here, since we can place the whole true meaning on the word Tröster, Comforter. And we, with most others, would hold fast the sanctified expression.

The fundamental point of view for this great word of promise is the presupposition—Ye *need* a Helper and Representative, such have I been while yet present with you. To this is then attached—although the *I will ask the Father* intimates that the Lord will continue His office, and indeed first really begin it, above—the promise of that *Other* who should carry on the same office *in another relation.* This, too, is intimated, if not in the *other*, yet in the *with you;* for we may say with the fullest truth that Christ carries on our cause with God, while the Holy Ghost, on the other hand, carries on God's cause *with us*, and for us against the world. He appropriates to us the supreme intercession of Christ as if it were inherent in ourselves (Rom. viii. 26), speaks in us and from us, as most essentially the intercessor whom our infirmity needs. Ask thyself, poor mortal, whether thou dost not need such! That the same Person also further comforts, encourages, reminds, teaches, is understood and involved in the same general fundamental idea.

That He may *abide* with you for ever! we cannot with Lücke accept Lachmann's reading (ἵνα μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα ᾖ) instead of the penetrating and affectionately consoling clause as it now stands; or admit that the μένῃ was transferred from ver. 17. The *abiding* of this *other* Comforter intimates the necessary contrast, that He does not go away like the first. The disciples would understand—I, as your sensibly present Helper and

[1] Which right expression he for the most part adds in his exposition and sermons; we read in *Kähler's* third Lutheran Catechism (Kiel, 1849) as the very words of Luther: "The word Comforter, from the Gr. paracletus, signifies one who stands as the counsel of an accused party, who takes of his to defend him, who pleads his cause and serves him by advice and help, admonition and encouragement, as his case needs." Similarly, Wicliff, from whom the English "Comforter" comes, derived it from the Latin *confortari* (see in Alford).

Counseller, go away, but through death to the Father, in order to pray the Father that He may give you another abiding Helper and Counseller. He will abide, without departing again, with you *εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα*—which last literally and essentially involves eternal communion with God in Christ through the Holy Ghost. But we must not, with Lampe, deduce from this a *δόμα ἀμεταμέλητον*, the impossibility of losing again the once received Spirit—the entire Scripture, and specifically Heb. vi. 4–6, protests against such a perversion.

Ver. 17. This other Agent, Representative, and Counsellor, now receives in immediate connection another name, derived from that *influence upon us which is primarily necessary*,—as further in the Old and New Testaments we find many names of the Holy Spirit designating Him according to His energies and gifts in us. It is *the Spirit:* this at once diverts from any such expectation of a visible Person as the *ἄλλος* might have excited, while it also points back to all which from the Old Testament had been recognised as the רוּחַ אֱלֹהִים or רוּחַ הַקֹּדֶשׁ. But now it is added, *The* Spirit *of the* truth, which repeated article expresses more than our common translation, Spirit of truth, or merely, The true Spirit. Beck says well: "They receive from Him not merely a dead word, such as all scholars have from their teachers; but they have a living word, the Spirit of the truth—for the life of the word is the Spirit." He has sufficiently shown already that he does not mean this in the sense which we must sometimes oppose in others, as if the Spirit was not coming in the future, but left behind; we would, however, prefer to say, in more scriptural language, that they have now from their Lord and Master *not merely* the word, the doctrine left behind Him, the most precious legacy of humanity, the words of the Word—but *in addition to* the word comes to them the Spirit, and that the Same who thought and spoke in Jesus, in order to re-awaken and vivify that word in them, for the *quickening* of the word is the Spirit. This alone is the true relation between the *coming* Paraclete and the words of Jesus *left behind*, as is shown in ver. 26, and ch. xvi. 14. The *Spirit* connects Himself with the word, works onwards, not independently of it, but through its medium: nevertheless He is, as Spirit, as coming in addition, the self-sufficient and sole *Teacher*,

who teaches over again the *doctrine* left behind in the letter, and Himself first gives it life.

Christ Himself had hitherto discharged His office of Paraclete to the disciples by His word, by the word from God to them, and to God for them; but this had been *to them*, on account of their weakness, only a shadow and type of the great reality. To say concerning their departed Lord with St John, *παράκλητον ἔχομεν πρὸς τὸν πατέρα Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν*—became their privilege only when that Other came, who being at the same time the Representative of Christ, *makes that their own*, placing them in clear and full and secure possession of that truth. We may thus unfold the subject: Every representative and counsel, every *advocatus*, is pre-eminently a *patronus* and friend of his client, but the first care of the benevolence of a true friend is to speak the truth, to reveal the true position of the case, favourable or unfavourable; that the client may thoroughly well know how it is with him. Hence this is also the indispensably first and fundamental business of our heavenly Advocate, although by no means the only or the last. He who makes the office and work of the promised Paraclete rest *solely* upon this "Spirit of truth," as so many do without a deeper understanding of it (ch. xvii. 17 will make this plain)—understands the meaning neither of the one name nor of the other. The Lord Himself can now speak no further of the subsequent, and essentially intercessory, work of the Spirit; He has only intimated it silently in the first name: that will be known hereafter when He comes, and the Spirit of truth approves Himself also the Spirit of grace and of prayer, of faith, of adoption, of power, of love and discipline, of holiness, and of glory—when they will be able to say by experience, with St Paul, *αὐτὸ τὸ πνεῦμα ὑπερεντυγχάνει ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν.*

Thus, for the first: The Spirit utters, teaches, brings to us as Spirit in real and living apprehension the Truth—that is, the truth concerning ourselves, the will of God as regards His justice and grace towards us, our position and calling, the way of return to God through the person of Christ; He shows, glorifies, *opens* to us this *way* as truth and life, so that we *know* what follows in ver. 20. He gives us as a first truth the knowledge of our sins, as a second the knowledge of the Saviour whom we possess, and these together are *the* real and perfect truth for us. He flatters

us not, as the false interloper Absalom at the way of the gate, See, thy matters are good and right—but He adds, nevertheless, with regard to our evil matters the word of full authority, Thou hast a man deputed, a mediator with the king! (2 Sam. xv. 3). This truth concerning our relation and way to God by no means dwells in our own spirit; all the mediators and friends who enter in by means of the natural understanding are deceivers and miserable comforters, מְנַחֲמֵי עָמָל—not only when they still charge poor Job foolishly, but also when they falsely justify him. But all such individual truth as had been already taken out of the whole truth, and testified and taught in the Old Testament, is completed and closed as the full consummate truth, *the truth* simply, by *the* Spirit whom now the Father sendeth in Christ's name, and Christ sendeth from the Father. "What no eye had seen, what Christ Himself could not say (at least, plainly and expressly), what no Christian can speak to the world and to the weak, *the Spirit* now teaches." (Häfeli.) We even continue, What generally may never be spoken and taught in human words! From the Spirit come to us not only the *groanings unutterable* of prayer, but also the *words unspeakable* of knowledge and revelation. Thus to Christians Pilate's question in every, even the best sense, is utterly abolished, because Christ no longer stands without before them alone, but the Spirit bears His witness that the Spirit is the truth. (1 John v. 6.)

But now after this abounding promise of the first name comes immediately the mournful, decisive restriction, Whom *the world* cannot receive! And why? Is not the old liar and murderer, the prince of this world, to be cast out, so that the world may be saved, and attain to life in the truth? Was not the Spirit to be poured out on *all flesh?* Do not all these promises, given to the first disciples as representatives of all future disciples, avail actually for all in the world who should afterwards hearken to and believe in the Spirit? Assuredly, but the Lord does not now refer to these, these He had already in anticipation fulfilled to the disciples; on the other hand, this same *world*, in the strictest and most rigorous sense of the word, remains and *first declares itself truly* such when the Spirit comes,—the world which receiveth not the Spirit *because it will remain the world.* It does not say, It *is not to* receive Him; but it *cannot*, for to receive Him re-

quires a *susceptibility*. It cannot—"such a word has the Lord Jesus spoken with profound sympathy, and when we utter it, it should be in the same feeling; but such a word, nevertheless, He did not see fit to withhold." (Rieger.) As long as it remains *world* as such it cannot, and with those who are here intended it must ever be so. And it may be said, alas, "baptism and anointing are wasted on the world"[1]—yea, also, the testimony and influence of the Spirit!

And *wherefore* not receive? "*Seeing* and *knowing* is the only way to receive and enjoy, in the kingdom of heaven even as in universal *nature*." (Häfeli.) It may at first appear strange that as for the Son so also for the invisible, inwardly working *Spirit* too, a *seeing* should be required; but this very θεωρεῖν teaches us the true sense in which alone it must be understood, for instance in ch. vi. 40 and elsewhere. The beginning and ground of all *knowing*, in which the object is appropriated by the subject, is an internal true *beholding* of the object; this is its necessary condition. To this beholding, especially of the truth itself in Christ, in the Spirit, belongs not merely unprejudicedness, but most essentially a desire and sense of need going out after it, and the want of this confounds and blinds the soul. Hezel was right when he unconsciously corrected himself thus (although *this* does not properly, certainly not solely, lie in the word θεωρεῖν), "Because the world *looks not about* for the Spirit of truth, troubles itself not about Him, and attaches no importance to Him." Or the Berlenb. Bible, "It turns not its eyes to Him, but *looks away from Him!*" It needs no Helper, it is contented even without the Father. It *desires*, and *therefore* "sees and knows only what is useful to it, receives only (to abuse and pervert) what the goodness of the Creator has inlaid into external nature and the nature of man; but it sees not and knows not what the saving grace of God proffers to it." (Beck.) But we must investigate the word more profoundly, for this is only its first meaning. As in the days of His flesh those who would not and could not behold the Son in Himself were yet constrained to *see* Him, and those who received not His word heard it at least, that the stony ground might be sown for a testimony—not

[1] Luther's Tischreden, latest edition by Förstemann, i. 15.

otherwise does the Spirit manifest Himself and offer Himself in His influence to the world. But now comes in the final emphasis of the following οὐδὲ γινώσκει—And *if* in a certain sense it is constrained by the power of God to see Him, *it knoweth Him not*, because and even as it does not *acknowledge* Him as the Spirit of the truth, and thus *will not* know Him. There is yet a truth in men, an assenting response, a criterion for the acceptance of the self-revealing truth of God; but it is held in unrighteousness, and this is strengthened by the *spirit of lies*, the opponent of the Paraclete. When devils are manifestly cast out by the Spirit of God, the daring Beelzebub will himself cry from the lips of his own, when he can do no more, to Christ—Thou castest them out by Beelzebub! What befell the Son at the hands of unbelief, is repeated with intenser energy and deeper decisiveness with regard to the Spirit. Let it be observed, that notwithstanding the name πνεῦμα He is spoken of as a *person* in the οὐ θεωρεῖ, as if it had been said, The world deals with Him as it deals with Me. And, finally, let it be noted that this exclusion of the world with the statement of the reason οὐ δύναται, was not intended as a warning to the beloved disciples (who were already no longer of the world, ch. xv. 19), but was graciously spoken beforehand for their *consolation*. This is excellently unfolded by Luther in an often-cited passage of his exposition, the ground-thoughts of which are: When they look around them and see so many people, not mean or insignificant, scorning their doctrine—this would terrify and stagger weak-believing hearts. Are they then all and altogether wrong, we alone being right? But this stumbling-block the Lord obviates for His little flock, and teaches them to question nothing about the world, so that they themselves have assuredly the Holy Spirit of truth.—*Therefore* follows, in order to indicate the great separation and decision which the Spirit will effect, the comforting *But ye* know Him! How then already in the Present? We must not misunderstand this as meaning, *Since ye already know Me;* or, then go on to make ὅτι (with Lampe) equivalent to διὸ, *Therefore He abideth also with you.* The Lord here once more evidently speaks in prolepsis; the present tenses as a whole intimate the future state of things, as Lücke rightly says, "Jesus places in juxtaposition and opposition the characteristics of the

κόσμος and of the disciples." Hence we are inclined to prefer, with him and with Luthardt, the reading ἐστίν instead of ἔσται, particularly on account of the corresponding ideas—The *Counsellor* abideth *with* them, the *Spirit* is *in* them. It must of course be assumed that the Apostles had been already made susceptible by Christ for receiving the Holy Ghost. "The coming of the Holy Ghost would so entirely coincide with all that they had understood of the Lord's words and intercourse with them, and with all that now followed, for the excitement of their desire and of their faith, that *they will at once know Him* by the Lord's former teaching." (Rieger.) Only, as in the case of the world the reasons for the *future* οὐ θεωρεῖν are intimated without being expressly uttered, even so it is in the case of the disciples; the γινώσκετε αὐτό cannot possibly mean at once that they already knew and possessed the Spirit in Christ, for the μένει plainly refers forward to the previously promised ἵνα μένῃ. And, in conclusion, the general contrast with the unbelieving *world*, not with other believers and disciples, makes it plain that the entire promise of the Comforter, and the ὑμεῖς δὲ here, by no means applies to the Apostles alone.

Ver. 18. Now indeed *these* are more particularly the representatives of all discipleship. They are His little children (ch. xiii. 33)—He the Father of the house, for whose sake they have forsaken father and mother, house and goods; yea, still more, had so utterly renounced the world that between them and it all was for ever at an end. And now He goes away from them, leaves them behind Him in this evil world—as with Mary weeping, They have taken away our Lord! Then would they be indeed sheep without a shepherd, *orphans* without father, protection, or help, without advocate or helper. It is well known that ὀρφανός is used generally *de omni destitutione;* but we hold fast the common signification, which partly adheres to the τεκνία of ch. xiii. 33, and partly refers to the Father in heaven, of whom they should not be deprived—see presently ver. 23. A new element is introduced into this gracious consolation for their amazed hearts, as we find it constantly recurring in these discourses—I will *not* leave you as orphans! I go away, but I come back again to you at once! We must not interpose here, with Semler, a foolish *interea*—I will not leave you altogether alone,

even so long as *till He, the Spirit cometh.* But the Present ἔρχομαι, which brings it so near and overpasses the ἔτι μικρόν of ver. 19, means much more than the resurrection return; it includes (according to the above canon of a perspective connection of comings) actually His coming to continue with them in the Spirit. The coming of the Comforter and the coming of the Lord Jesus are essentially one: He cannot humanly speak of them otherwise than by making them interchangeable, distinguishing and yet uniting them. Augustin: Post promissionem Spiritus sancti, ne quisquam putaret, quod ita eum Dominus daturus fuerat, velut pro se ipso, ut non et ipse cum eis esset futurus, adjecit atque ait: Veniam ad vos. The Representative of His visible presence is Another, and yet in the unity of the Trinity it is no other than Christ Himself in His invisible real presence.[1] The resurrection was the pledge and further preparation for this coming, and of this ver. 19 expressly speaks, though not only of this. It is altogether inadmissible to refer it, with some of the ancients, to a coming to *judge the world;* for there is no ἔτι μικρόν reaching so far, nor would it be true that *the world will not then see Him.* Both these are decisive against Luthardt's exaggerated reference to the Parousia at the last day, although he thinks he has established it here! This ἔτι μικρόν is, in fact, not the same as that of Heb. x. 37, or equivalent to the ταχύ of Rev. xxii. 7, 12. And it would be contrary to the entire context in *these* discourses to think of the whole church as being orphaned or comfortless till the last day!

Ver. 19. In ἔτι μικρόν thus connected with ζήσεσθε the Lord probably thinks of that prophecy of His resurrection *on the third day*[2] which is to be discerned in Hos. vi. 2: καὶ ζησόμεθα ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ; and the καὶ γνωσόμεθα following here in ver. 20 strengthens this view. It is indubitable that the resurrection, to which the first words properly refer, is *first* of *all* intended

[1] Not merely, "The Jesus of their child-faith is glorified into the Spirit of truth for the faith of the man" (as Braune improperly says)—but even the Spirit of the truth makes Himself ever more perfectly known as the Christ living in us. Kahnis: "It cannot be doubted that the Lord views the sending of *the Holy Ghost* as a *coming back in His own person.*"

[2] See upon this prophecy, our remarks in vol. i. on Matt. ix. 9, etc.

(as ch. xvi. 16 in a wider connection), and that their seeing Him again in the body must be included, although Lücke contradicts this; not only is the resurrection included, but it is in ἔτι μικρόν, in οὐκέτι θεωρεῖ (Acts x. 40, 41, a type of the exclusion of the world from seeing the Holy Ghost), and finally in ἐγὼ ζῶ, positively and strongly expressed. Even Kuinoel and de Wette agree with Lampe and Bengel in assuming a "double sense" here; though the meaning is not properly double, but is one in the centre of the scriptural truth.[1] The discourse advances with a deepening development of the expressions—*Ye* shall *see* Me first externally, then and thereafter in the Spirit, ye shall *live* as I live, when ye shall *have* Me abidingly in the Spirit. First, there will intervene a renewal of the bodily seeing, which is the transition to their living. Then, too, *living* must be taken here in the full and deep sense of the word, especially after the promise of the Spirit who should be in them.[2] This Spirit gives *counsel* and performs His *work*, He is in the Spirit of truth also the Spirit of life. For what would be counsel without help, what would be all truth without new power, without new life in order to the obedience of the truth? The mere so-called knowledge avails not for this. Therefore *Spirit* of the truth, and the Spirit who *giveth life* by the truth. Christ designedly omits to say ζήσομαι concerning *Himself*,—although His meaning includes a reference to the resurrection as demonstrating His inextinguishable Divine life,—for He liveth in God eternally. Yet He does actually utter this ζῶ "with death in view"—makes it a *pledge* to His disciples that they shall have a life, beginning with their spiritual resurrection and extending onwards to eternity—*implicitly promises*, consequently, also the subsequent bodily resurrection of all His own, but all as resting upon the sole life-principle imparted by the quickening Spirit. He who possesses the Spirit and in Him Christ, may speak joyfully and

[1] "It would have been very strange if Jesus had not at this moment referred to His resurrection, just at the time when His disciples most needed such a consolation; and it is doing unnatural violence to the ἐγὼ ζῶ to regard it as having no such reference." So de Wette, who then, though not clearly or profoundly enough, connects with this the spiritual reference.

[2] Hezel's dull spirit thus expounded: When I show Myself alive again, ye *also shall be still alive!* For they might have feared that they would all be destroyed.

confidently in the presence of death to the king of terrors, in the language of Luther: "Knowest thou not that thou didst devour the Lord Christ, but wert obliged to give Him back, and wert devoured of Him? so thou must leave me undevoured because I abide in Him, and live and suffer for His name's sake. Man may hunt me out of the world and put me underground, and that I care not for; but I shall not on that account abide in death, I shall live with my Lord Christ, as I know and believe *that He liveth!*" There is *no* other guarantee for our personal continuance in the integrity of our being, and consequently, also, as that is inseparable, for the resurrection of our bodies, than *the personality of Christ*, in whose ἐγὼ ζῶ, declared in His resurrection and assured to us by the reception of His Spirit in ourselves, we have the firm and sufficient foundation for—καὶ ὑμεῖς ζήσεσθε.[1] All other arguments and hopes of immortality are like shadows and vapour before the light and power of this living word. (Rev. i. 17, 18.)

Vers. 20, 21. By the general formula of the Prophets for an indefinitely left Future opened up in perspective—בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא, the repeated use of which (ch. xvi. 23, 26) places these discourses under the canons for the exposition of all prophecy,—is denoted here specifically, as sometimes in the Prophets, the near and certain dawn of the *day* of a more glorious future, of clearer light.[2] This now promised γνώσεσθε serves as a confirming interpretation of the γινώσκετε, ver. 17, and even ver. 7. Then, when the day of Pentecost has become the Easter day of your hearts, will ye no longer say unto Me, Lord show us the Father! nor will ye say any more, Lord, show us

[1] As Göschel's Ostergabe (1835) bears this great word as its motto. R. Rothe would *conversely* base upon the certain continuance of our own being as spirit, the faith in a continuance of Christ's life (now without flesh).

[2] "Such things in truth understands no man, for whom *the day* has not dawned which Abraham beheld of old with joy" (rather—desired to see, and saw when Christ came), "and concerning which Jesus spoke to His disciples, Jno. xiv. 20, At that day ye shall know, etc." Oetinger. This is more in the spirit of St John than Luthardt's over-rigorous eschatological exposition, who thinks that the only alternative is the day of Pentecost or the day of the Parousia. Does he not in any sense acknowledge the prophetical perspective?

Thyself! at least without receiving the fulfilment of your desire. The three stages of mutual indwelling are to be understood according to chap. x. 14, 15. The knowledge that Christ is in the Father (as the Father in Him, ver. 11) may be without living influence, or may be still held by those in whom it has become unfruitful; but the knowledge that we are in Him is really possible only through the Spirit of truth and of life, and leads at once to the last and highest conclusion, that He also is in us. After the Lord has thus, vers. 15–20, risen from the first preparatory commencement of fellowship with Himself up to its full consummation, He now comprehends in one summary both sides of the truth,—the first love to Himself in the germ of faith is the condition of a perfect future revelation. *My commandments*—to be understood just as in ver. 15 of His *ῥήματα* or *ἐντολαί* given over to them, and waiting for the quickening influence of the Spirit, Matt. xxviii. 20. *Ὁ ἔχων καὶ τηρῶν* is not one and the same by any means, so that *ἔχων* standing first should be equivalent to *κατέχων*; but the *ἔχειν* relates to the first essential condition that a person must have been already an external disciple of Jesus, and hearer and receiver of His words. The *τηρεῖν*, then, is not to be regarded as referring to perfect practical obedience; for how could that be made the preliminary condition for the receiving of the Holy Ghost?[1] But it is that believing-loving, loving-believing attention and regard to His words which springs from dependence of the heart upon Him; that which is again spoken of chap. xv. 20, the first *μένειν ἐν τῷ λόγῳ*, chap. viii. 31. This first willing desire to keep avails in the sight of grace *as if* it were keeping in the fullest sense; such a man as would fain love although the words of ver. 28 must be spoken to him for his humbling, is dealt with as already an *ἀγαπῶν*. It will be more fully disclosed in ver. 23 what this loving and therefore being loved means; we must now single out with Judas the last great word by which the Lord offers all the fulness of God as contained in His own person—I will *manifest Myself* unto

[1] Thus the words of Augustine which Tholuck quotes, are incorrect in this connection, however otherwise true: Qui habet in memoria et servat in vita, qui habet in sermonibus et servat in moribus, qui habet audiendo et servat faciendo, qui habet faciendo et servat perseverando.

him![1] Beyond this, promise has nothing greater or higher for man; for this ἐμφανίζειν is indeed no mere making known or showing, but the indwelling of the Father and the Son, as follows in ver. 23, the goal already with which chap. xvii. 21–26 closes all. Nevertheless, this high promise is given without distinction to *every one* who hath and who regardeth the commandments of the Lord.

Instead of contentedly resting upon that love which here promised the fulness of its revelation to all everywhere in whom the response of dawning love was found; instead of sinking with heart and mind into the depths of this profound word; one of the disciples again interposes an objection. Whether Thomas, Philip, and lastly Judas, made these interruptions, simply because "the more thoughtful, profound, and greater Apostles, Peter, James, and John, kept silence," that is, felt less in them to object to (as Braune thinks)—appears to us exceedingly doubtful. For Peter's silence, at least, we have already found another reason; and the speaker appears to us to speak in the name of all, John possibly excepted. We have here the sole recorded word of Judas Lebbæus or Thaddæus. Niemeyer's Charakteristik notes here a very subtile trait in the Evangelist John, who at the mere mention of another with the same name is so affected by the remembrance of the fearful sin of Judas Iscariot, by himself most impressively recorded, that he cannot omit to warn against confounding the two. We leave this over-critical observation to its merits; more safe and more significant is another of Dräseke, that we never read concerning Iscariot that he entered in any way into his Master's words, that he ever put even a question of rash curiosity. It would be best of all, however, to say, that St John designs by this addition to intimate how even a *sincere* disciple did not yet apprehend the meaning of the Lord's word.

The world not—but ye! Jesus had never before made any such distinction, never before renounced, as it were, so plainly the acknowledgment of the world and His own revelation to it. This outrages the Jewish ideas of the Messiah and His expected kingdom, as held not only by Judas but by all the Apostles.

[1] Which Nonnus most unjustifiably limits to the Resurrection—*καὶ οἱ θέσκελον εἶδος ἐμοῦ χροὸς αὐτίκα δείξω.*

They are far from understanding as yet how much would follow from the principle that the *truth* of God must *sever* between those who receive it and those who reject it; that the *love* will be far from being found in all men, while only in connection with the response of love the entrance and abiding of God can take place, and the setting up of the kingdom become possible; they know not yet in what a great and sad reality a contradictory and excluded *world* must remain. Is not the Messiah a *King* of even the whole world? This is their dubious thought, as Luther still more strongly expresses it: "What kind of king will he be who will let no man see him, and spread his kingdom so silently and secretly that no man can see or know it, save the very few who love it?" Thus is it that only a handful in secret are to enjoy his hidden manifestation? Hence they are entangled in that foolish notion of a great, all-uniting kingdom of Christ which bewitches so many even in our own day, so that the pretensions of the little company make them go astray in the mass, and they devise every kind of Spirit and Christ besides to meet their views. Thus the disciples themselves are here somewhat like the unbelieving brethren, whose desire was, ch. vii. 4—*Show Thyself to the world!* The *καὶ τί*, if genuine, indicates (as ch. ix. 36) the zeal of the honest question—Ecquidnam factum est? *Γέγονεν* does not stand, as it has been superficially supposed, for *γίνεται*, or the whole formula for מֶה הָיָה—How comes it then, how can this be? (In the Lond. Heb. N. T. אֵיךְ תִּהְיֶה זֹאת.) But Judas would say, as v. Gerlach keenly seizes it, *What has occurred?* We would translate it most simply, What then has *taken place*, that is, come between, that the world is now to be excluded from Thy manifestation? Although the Lord, ver. 17, had plainly said and given the reason—The world *cannot* receive the Spirit (as it comes not to the light of the word which prepares to that end, ch. iii. 19)—yet Judas had overlooked this, or forgotten it; and hence he proposes his question with an improper *μέλλεις*, which cannot otherwise be translated than as *θέλεις*. We have in his the type of all similar questions, which are constantly obtruded whenever the word is seen to be visibly fulfilled—The world seeth not and knoweth not the Spirit of the truth! The folly or despondency of men, alas, which

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY

would have a greater and prematurely visibly great kingdom of the Lord Jesus, utters the question of Judas, which in him might be excused; and will not rest in the answer and decision. *Whoso* loveth Me—whoso *loveth* Me *not*—that is the test, and all comes to that! But *humility* also, which knows not its own poor love enough to ground its own election out of the world upon it, utters in a most blessed meaning, and with perfect propriety, the same question.[1]

Ver. 23. The Lord scarcely does more than repeat that which had appeared to the disciple so unintelligible or ungrounded that he was obliged to presuppose some not yet declared γέγονεν; yet the repetition is actually explanatory, since the decisive loving now in the answer takes the lead. And, further, the declaration is strengthened—And the Father will come with Me, we will make our abode with Him! *If any man love Me*—that is the great γέγονεν in every soul which is decisive for its deliverance from the present evil world (Gal. i. 4; Acts ii. 40). If Judas had known what the world is, and what *every* human heart by nature, he would rather have wondered how Jesus could reveal Himself to any man, in order to his perfect love and fidelity in the knowledge of the whole truth:—therefore the reply places this first; and that with an ἐάν τις (comp. ch. vii. 37) which seems to intimate the rareness of this love, while ὁ μὴ ἀγαπῶν afterwards seems to intimate what is the general rule. In Prov. viii. 17 the eternal wisdom of God, whose delight is to dwell with the children of men, lays down the same decisive condition—I love them that love Me; while the following clause—And those that seek Me early shall find Me, explains and unites these two—the first love of desire and the rewarding love of attainment. *On this principle* the Lord's words in vers. 15 and 21 should always have been explained, thus resolving the anomaly of the promise itself being made a condition. Is not this often apparent? No man can call Jesus a Lord but by the Holy Ghost; and again no man can receive the Holy Ghost but by calling upon the Lord for Him. It is self-understood, however, that our first calling, coming, and loving, can

[1] But this must not be so attributed to Judas as to make him mean: τι γέγονεν, what has been done *by us*, whereby have *we deserved* such especial prerogative?

by no means take place in our own strength and to our own praise; for He has previously offered Himself, invited and drawn our souls, exhibited and impressed His love upon us. How else could He say, If any man love *Me?* He is with us already, offers Himself beforehand for all, waits with seeking and desire on His part to find *who* will love Him in return. Once more: This first loving, which is the point of decision on our part, is the essential germ of life in living faith. If elsewhere and ordinarily the great test is believing or not believing, this is indeed only the same; but this last manner of speaking on the part of our Lord is more testing and convincing with respect to all who are already around Him as His disciples. "Love itself often includes (in John) the idea of faith, and is nothing but an acting faith, the breath or the life of faith." (Hamann.) Just so speaks Sartorius (Lehre v. d. heil. Leibe ii. 152), though his critic Schöberlein would complete his meaning, showing that he might have carried his argument further, and proved the nature of love to exist in faith itself. A theological or homiletic terminology which speaks of love in the place of faith may very easily degenerate into a false illuminist doctrine; but if the application be made in the right place it may be shown to have much truth. Nor is it right to say that this is the peculiarity of St John, for the Evangelist, and the Lord in his gospel, ever speaks most about believing, to the disciples and to the world; it should rather be ascribed to the closer and more internal character of these *last* discourses, and may be termed, as it were, *esoterical*, and in connection with this—for here is the test of all teaching concerning love—there could not be lacking the reference back to faith, as we find in ch. xiv. 1, 11, 12; xvi. 9, 27, 31. The Lord might have said, according to the analogy of ch. xiv. 21, He who loveth Me, he it is who believeth on Me. For valid faith is not a mere assent of the understanding, or obedient acceptance of the *word;* in the word the *person of the Lord* ever witnesses and offers itself:—consequently, what is wanting is a *personal response* and devotion of the heart, and that is the love in faith.[1] The

[1] "Faith lays hold of the love of God, and receives that love into the Spirit. It was such even in the Old Testament as it entered into the Divine revelations of love as far as they had been made." (Schöberlein.)

fulness of the love of God is manifested to us, attracts and moves us, in the personality of the *Son of man, worthy of supreme love;* how can it be but that our posture towards this person of Christ should declare and decide whether we are or are not susceptible and disposed to give admission to redeeming love. He who hateth Christ, hateth also His Father! (Ch. xv. 23.) There may be many who already in this sense *love* Him, who cannot yet call Him Lord by the Holy Ghost: despise not *that*, but wait till the Lord *shall* manifest Himself to such! "Honour every man, even the least, who has love to Christ in his heart!" This excellent rule out of Richter's Hausbibel tells very forcibly against much of our dogmatic rigour of requirement, against much of our bigoted ecclesiastical restriction. Learn better what *love* is, ye zealots, and make the banner of love to the Lord the sole banner of His Church! Zeller thus applies this saying to the subject of Christian instruction: "Thus even a *child* which has love to the Saviour is capable of the manifestation and indwelling of the Lord." Yes, assuredly, every childlike susceptible offering up of a loving heart receives perpetually and more and more living knowledge and experience as its reward. And the same holds good of the most advanced.

If a man love Me he *will* keep My words: thus the further condition laid down in vers. 15–21 becomes itself a first *promise.* Love only, and it will of itself thus follow! "The order seems reversed, but it is essentially one and the same either way"—preaches Schleiermacher. But let the difference of the expression in the two sentences be noted, and further that the latter fully explains the former. *Λόγον* instead of *ἐντολάς* teaches us, as we have said, that the full keeping of the law is not yet meant; although the ancient expositors mostly so understand it.[1] The word of Jesus speaks of repentance, coming, praying, believing: these are pre-eminently and first of all His commandments. He who willingly hears these, though it may be once and in one word, and retains and revolves Christ's word in His heart, being seized by its power; and then penitently comes, prays, believes so far as his early

The final unbelief in Christ which is ripe for condemnation, is "a heart closing itself against the highest love." (Jul. Müller, on Sin.)

[1] Gregory the Great, in particular, in a Pentecost sermon on this section.

weakness will allow him—is already a partaker of the first promise, and the second greater one will not fail him. Luther: "He will keep My words; that does not mean the word of Moses and the preaching of the law, but the preaching of love and grace such as He manifests to us." Such τηρεῖν may well consist with great lack of understanding, and much infirmity in action; if only that can be truly said which was said of the disciples, ch. xvii. 6–8, as preparatory to the coming Easter-day and day of Pentecost.[1] The testing question, Believest thou on the word of Jesus? still closer, on Jesus Himself? is, alas, answered by many prematurely in the affirmative. Then presses more closely and testingly the record, Lovest thou Him? Answer to this a confident Yes, only when thou dost experience the beginning and continuance of that which here follows—the keeping of His word!

Now comes the rewarding love for such as thus love, in its full communion or manifestation. The Father's will is that His Son, and Himself in the Son, should be loved; and where He finds the beginning of this, oh how He returns that love, for He will and He can now shed abroad the fulness of His Divine complacency! That Jesus loves them that love Him, has been already seen in ver. 21; now it is further shown that assuredly *the Father* also, yea properly the Father through Him, will love them. *Will* love? Has He not already first loved, and that, according to ch. iii. 16, even the whole world? This universal love of compassion, previous to all our willing, running, loving, keeping, is to be strictly distinguished from the especial love of His approval. The Father loves all sinners, therefore sends He and gives to them the Son—all heathens, therefore must the Gospel be preached to them—all so-called Christians, therefore He bears with them and allures them with so much long-suffering patience; but He specially loves only those who love His Son in faith, and it is to them that His love gives the Spirit, and to them He *comes*. (Ch. xvi. 27.)

Less and Semler gave forth formerly an insipid interpreta-

[1] For which we should wait with sincere patience, if need be, as Oetinger (Evang.-Predigt. S. 388) exhorts beginners to hold fast the word, and not, before the Spirit of God comes into the soul, to strike sparks for themselves with flint and steel,—Isa. l. 10, 11.

tion, which would remove the mystery of the *μονή* and the *unio mystica: καὶ πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐλευσόμεθα,* and *We,* that is, I and you My beloved disciples, will *one day* (according to vers. 2, 3) come *to the Father* and take up our abode with Him![1] Oh no, this *dwelling* of God with men, that is *in their hearts,* where *love* is and to which the *Spirit* comes, is the New Testament fulfilment of all the promises which have referred to this, from Lev. xxvi. 11 down to Ezek. xxxvii. 27, xxxvi. 27. "Heaven and earth, the palaces of all kings and Cæsars, cannot give a dwelling to God; but with men, who keep His word, will He make His abode. Although Isaiah calls heaven His throne and earth His footstool, he calls them not His dwelling."[2] This is the *mystery* of the שְׁכִינָה of which the wise in Israel know how to speak and the foolish to babble. This is no *figure,* but the most essential truth.[3] Further, the Lord distinguishes the *coming* from this *abiding.* With the sincere this latter is the certain consequence; but in the case of the insincere, who keep not the words which they know, there may be many visitations, which end not in permanent indwelling. As, according to Acts xvii. 28, the power of God naturally dwells and works in and around us, so also His Spirit, His love, His holy life. As sin dwells in our hearts as a home; so does the new love which casts it out, which is shed abroad by the Holy Ghost, and conquers all. (Rom. v. 5, viii. 37–39.) It is clear in itself that the Lord speaks of the coming and indwelling of the *Spirit;* He was previously included, and when the Son unites Himself with the Father in this wondrous *We,* an internal fellowship with the *Triune God* is promised. For that purpose we have here, but once only, the bold expression—a *coming* even of the *Father.*[4]

[1] Klee says, unhappily: this *might* be so understood. He does not consider, apart from the connection (according to which *μονὴν ποιεῖν* must correspond to the *ἐμφανίζειν*), how inconsistent such a uniting *We* would be, and the *ποιήσομεν* as applied to believers equally with Christ.

[2] Luther's Tischreden i. 54.

[3] Hezel: "Figure does not explain anything clearly; and we ought not to speculate much about the indwelling of God in man, as our dogmatists and preachers used to do. Children only play with figures."

[4] This last, again, is significant against Luthardt's narrow *eschatological* reference even of this coming to the "goal of all history," Rev. xxi. 3—

Ver. 24. He that loveth *Me not*—a horrendum dictu for every man who knoweth Him! In sorrowful gentleness expressed—Not to love the Loveliest, the most worthy of all love, yea Love itself! But it is essentially *to hate*, for there is no neutrality in the plain truth of God, which everywhere makes the decisive separation: hence even in Ex. xx. 5, 6, there is but this alternative. Assuredly, thou must either love or hate Christ; for to decline or ignore His word altogether, when it comes to thee, and especially His cross, is utterly impossible. All semblance of indifference is merely semblance. So also the οὐ τηρεῖν of the words of our Lord is essentially an ἀθετεῖν (Lu. x. 16), a fearful contempt and casting behind of what is nevertheless heard. "Knowledge and conscience of all men must admit that nothing can be more beautiful, nothing more consistent and harmonious, nothing more reasonable, than the doctrine of Jesus understood and proclaimed in honest words and without human artifice." (Oetinger.) Yea, *heart* and conscience must submit to the influence of the drawing, supplicating love of God—yet there is no loving, no holding fast and keeping of the word of eternal love! Before, it was τὸν λόγον, now significantly τοὺς λόγους, because unbelief does not embrace in their unity the individual sayings, but dismisses them as they are isolated. The disciples hear in all words One Word, and that, as He frequently testified, not as His own words only, but as the Father's who sent Him. But it is this which the person μὴ ἀγαπῶν in the world will not believe, although the Father hath actually sent to him the Son who speaks directly to him.—Thus the answer of Jesus for Judas and all disciples (which enlargement of the address lies already in the ἀκούετε) would put the counter-question—Does the world then *love* Me? Will the world suffer itself to be loved, or even instructed? *Can* I manifest Myself to it, to it which *cannot* receive the Spirit? The knowledge of the truth first cannot be enforced, simply because

which on all grounds is utterly untenable. Is not the individual here spoken of, as opposed to the world; and does not the whole chapter speak of *that* coming which coincides with the coming of the Spirit? If this young teacher had been a preacher he would not have taken away from the pulpit this *Pentecost* subject, and opposed the ecclesiastical selection of the Gospel, here if anywhere appropriate!

a corresponding love of the heart is requisite. But to love is evidently something altogether free, and God's kingdom in Christ will have no other subjects than such as thus voluntarily love; it therefore renounces beforehand the *world* as such.

"And thus has the Lord (says Lange) set aside the *three main stumbling-blocks* which, having their origin in worldly confusion, darken the disciples' apprehension of the coming time." He means—without giving sufficiently precise definitions of them—the offence of the morbid doubter Thomas, ver. 5, who will *know* all with the understanding; that of the doubter Philip, eager for manifestations, to whom only a *visible* Theophany of the Father, a sign, sufficeth; finally, that of the doubter Judas (not Iscariot) holding friendship with the world, who would too readily receive the whole world into the kingdom of God.

THE HOLY GHOST, ONCE MORE, AS TEACHER AND REMEMBRANCER; THE PEACE LEFT BEHIND, AND GIVEN ANEW THROUGH HIS DEPARTURE TO THE GREATER FATHER; THE POWERLESSNESS OF THE PRINCE OF THE WORLD IN HIS AGGRESSION UPON HIM.

(Chap. xiv. 25–31.)

In this preliminary conclusion the Lord, still deferring to close His words, and ever beginning anew, returns back to the commencement of His whole discourse. As if He had already spoken all, He nevertheless continues to speak. He now refers again in plain words to His *departure* to the Father, after which the Comforter will come and make all things plain to their understanding. Then as a *farewell* He speaks of the *peace*, which in a certain sense He bequeathes and leaves to them, but which He will be able to give in its fulness when He goes to His greater Father, and becomes Himself greater than now in His humiliation, in which in the obedience of suffering He overcomes the world's prince.

Vers. 25, 26. Luther: "These are simply last words, which our Lord gives to His disciples as the close and seal of His preaching and consolation, because He is about to separate from

them; as if He would say, I have been hitherto with you, and have given you My word, and comforted you with My own lips, that ye may keep yourselves when I am removed from you. And it is true that the comfort of the words which I have spoken is excellent, great, and high; but because I am still with you they do not so go to your hearts that ye can enjoy the sweetness and power of them; *ye think only that it is I who am speaking such words.*"—Assuredly, as Tholuck says, "It appears as if Christ was disposed here to arise from the table and end His sayings"—but it only *appears* so, and He Himself probably knew that and how much He would speak.[1] We must attribute to the soul of Jesus an altogether human affection of heart here; His words begin anew and are prolonged on and on, as takes place at all important farewells; and the "I go now" may have been more than once uttered. Only *in the Spirit* He is sublimely elevated above all this,—and as often as He begins afresh to speak of the *departure* which filled His soul, new words ever offer themselves to His conscious will, and these He must speak. B.-Crusius, therefore, quite incorrectly terms what follows, vers. 25–31, "detached consolatory sayings, in the language of feeling, not new and not connected!" Rather shall we find in every verse a distinctively new thought, not simply poured out from feeling to feeling:—as we have endeavoured to show in our preparatory analysis.

Λελάληκα neither here nor at chap. xv. 11, xvi. 1, 4, 6, 25, 33, stands simply instead of λαλῶ: it springs from that pervading farewell feeling, and is parallel with the *εἴρηκα* of ver. 29. It *first of all* refers in each instance of its occurrence to what had just been said; and consequently here to the sayings which had been unintelligible to the disciples since ver. 2; especially to the exclusion of the world from His manifestation. But this does not hinder us from supposing the Lord in these final utterances to contemplate the conclusion *of all His discourses with*

[1] We could not say, at least, with Schleiermacher: "As He closes (afterward ver. 31) with, Arise let us go hence! it appears that humanly He knew not whether afterwards on the way, and as long as His disciples were with Him, He would be strong enough to speak further with them, or whether He would not in silence wait for the final issues of His earthly destiny."

the disciples, comprehending the whole course of them from the beginning. We, must not however, with B.-Crusius regard this as the sole meaning, and make *ταῦτα* His *λόγοι*, *ἐντολαί* (vers. 24, 21)—but rather, *Herewith*, with *these* last-spoken words, My speaking, teaching, discoursing have an end. That we ought not to exclude the general glance back upon the past, is shown by the *παρ' ὑμῖν μένων* which embraces the whole period of His visible presence, in connection with the immediately following contrast, in which it more plainly follows, *πάντα ἃ εἶπον ὑμῖν.*

When He now once again points to that Other in His place, the abiding One, He introduces Him by a third, and that His most plain and intelligible name—*the Holy Ghost.* He *connects* now, for its fullest illustration, this well-known term with the mysteriously sounding *Paraclete* which had been first used, after having formed a transition for it in the middle by "*Spirit* of the truth." The Father will *send* Him, just as (ver. 24) He has *sent* the Son (comp. Gal. iv. 4, 6)—this is an expression appropriate only to personality, and one which, to speak now simply and unspeculatively, places the "Holy Ghost" as the Third in order with the Father and the Son, just as it is finally in Matt. xxviii. 19. The *ἐκεῖνος*, corresponding with the *ἄλλος*, has been defrauded of its force in the argument, by the remark that it refers only to the name *παράκλητος*; but that of itself is not true, since *τὸ πνεῦμα ὃ πέμψει* has intervened, and in ch. xvi. 13, 14, the same *ἐκεῖνος* stands quite removed from *παράκλητος*, while it is strikingly linked to the *τὸ πνεῦμα.* And is not the personal official name, in equality with the person of Jesus, of itself decisive? He who can regard all the therewith connected personal expressions (of teaching, reminding, testifying, coming, convincing, guiding, speaking, hearing, prophesying, taking) in these three chapters as being no other than a long drawn out figure, deserves not to be recognised even as an interpreter of intelligible words, much less as an expositor of Holy Scripture. There is a certain propriety in referring to the after-coming of the Spirit when Jesus had gone, the analogy of lower things in which "the teacher is honoured when he is gone from us; *his word remains behind as influential spirit*, and stands detached from the earthly accidents of its author, as a legacy which is so to speak glori-

fied."[1] Thus in the case of Christ Himself His sensible presence stood in the way of the disclosure of His Spirit, and the full understanding of His words; *because* He was with them and stood before them, they could not apprehend Him. But the relations of His person and doctrine pass beyond the region of all analogy here; for it is not simply the word left behind which becomes spirit, but, as we remarked before, at this point He *distinguishes* most decisively the new and superadded *teacher* from the *words* which Himself had spoken.

The Father will send Him *in My name:* this is not exhausted when we expound, "upon the supplication, through the mediation, of the Son, when we pray for the Spirit in His name." But as the Son, according to ch. v. 43, is come *in the Father's name* (we must ever take the phraseology of the Lord Jesus in consistency with itself), that is, as sent from the Father, proceeding from Him, and in such a sense that the Father wholly worketh, liveth, and is in the Son—so similarly the Spirit sent from the Father comes at the same time as not only *prayed for* by the Son, but *sent* by Him (hence ch. xv. 26), and in such a manner that the Son Himself is and comes in Him. Thus Meyer says, correctly—As My Representative; which, moreover, lies plainly in the immediate connection, for *instead of* the Teacher who did not *remain*, who has now *spoken* His words, this Teacher will fulfil the work. The Spirit of God is at the same time the Spirit of Christ, the Spirit of the Son. (Rom. viii. 9; Gal. iv. 6.) The διδάξει καὶ ὑπομνήσει will thus be rightly understood in its depth of meaning! That the former word does not immediately refer to ἃ εἶπον, but that the first πάντα involves an independent and wider meaning—*All things* which yet can and must be taught, which ye still need to know, concerning which ye would desire when I am gone to question and hear Me—is perfectly true, and is confirmed by the πάντα (1 Jno. ii. 20, 27), as also by the *leading into all truth*, ch. xvi. 13. But this still-remaining teaching is not anything altogether new; the Son had already told them *all things*, which ch. xvi. 14, 15 prevents us from overlooking. Tholuck takes a very superficial view of the combined expressions; he is almost cor-

[1] As v. Meyer says, without any Rationalist spirit in this comparison with Christ, in his beautiful "Trost für Lehrer und Vorsteher."

rect in his first limitation of the πάντα to the "hard things and those of His words which the disciples had not apprehended."[1] But he then goes on to say of the ὑπομιμνήσκειν,—That which is not understood is all the more easily forgotten, but the Spirit could not inwardly unfold in instruction what was not at least in the remembrance; consequently, He would "*also* revive that which had faded out of their memory." It opposes this too external view of the bringing to remembrance that the πάντα ἃ εἶπον is connected also with that; but the disciples could not possibly *forget* all His discourses, and the Lord could never have made this a supposable case. Here Lücke is right (with Augustin, Beda, Rupert): "the teaching and bringing to remembrance are not distinct methods of the Spirit's instruction,—only completing or only continuing their instruction—but both are inseparably one in spirit." Not, therefore, with Theophylact: "He taught what Christ did not teach, because they could not receive it; He brought to remembrance what He had spoken, but what the disciples could not retain in memory because they understood it not." (Similarly, Theod. Mops., and Euthymius.) But the second clause in our Lord's words *explains* and *restricts* the first by a vau exegeticum; the ground of which lies in the unuttered middle-term—that He Himself had actually said *all things* in their essential principle, just as in chap. xvi. 13, 14. Think not that I promise you *altogether new* teaching and manifestations of the Paraclete.[2] His teaching will be no more than a bringing to remembrance. "The Holy Spirit should *say over* again to them what of His words they had *forgotten and had not understood.* So diligently had the Lord provided against the possibility of man's law being established in His church, that He had seen fit to say all things before, even though not at once observed and understood." (Luther, Antwort auf das Buch Emser's.) Fikenscher's opinion

[1] But we would go a little deeper:—the inmost kernel of His doctrine, with all things not in them κατὰ τὸ ῥητόν, but to be deduced and developed from it.

[2] The perversion of this, after the Mohammedan or fanatical style, would make Heb. i. 1, 2, run differently: "and after He had spoken not yet perfectly by His Son, He continues now to speak by His Spirit, though not yet His *last* words."

is philologically unfounded, that ὑπομιμνήσκειν, in *distinction* from ἀναμιμνήσκειν, refers to the entering into the depth and essence of the words, to the estimating and weighing of what they had heard; on the other hand, it is quite certain that the *two* expressions indicate not merely the recalling of something properly forgotten, but in many cases also the hortatory impressing of what was well known in word, thus first bringing it to their understanding. What I altogether apprehend I may be said to know. Thus ὑπομιμνήσκειν is here equivalent to our Erinnern,[1] in the pregnant and deep sense, "not merely to call back the words to their remembrance, but to open to them the words which they had heard, but which had remained obscure, to disclose with undeceiving clearness the meaning of the sayings of Jesus." (v. Gerlach.) It must be understood, at the same time, that all this does not exclude that actual reviving in the memory which is the foundation of the word and of the idea, and of which this gospel itself is an example.

Further, this bringing to remembrance includes exhortation to faith and the keeping of Christ's word, to the obedience of His precepts. On account of our weakness or our sinfulness, we forget, alas, the most familiar words just where they should be remembered, and there is always need that one should stand behind us ready to pronounce our duty in our ears. And this office, according to Isa. xxx. 20, 21, is assumed by the Teacher, who is always internally present and will no more depart,—and the *suggeret* of the Vulg. (though not enough) well suits this meaning. All this is here included; but the comprehensive ground-idea is the unity of teaching and reminding in order to perfect understanding, faith, and obedience. Whenever the disciples had to say in after time, Alas we cannot now think of this or that, what He then said and how He said it—then might they call upon the Reminder on the ground of the promise which they had received. If they had to cry,—Alas, we know it well, but we do not fully understand it—then came in the Teacher, and what they then understood, they now first held and obeyed aright. If they might think, On this subject

[1] Braune popularly applies the German word thus—"that it would work internally, livingly, clearly, and mightily in them—that is erinnern, Erinnerung."

the Lord never spoke any direct word—the Spirit would show them in the ground of some saying, as in the spirit of the collective doctrine of Jesus, the germ and the test for all further necessary and possible truth. (1 Cor. vii. 25, 40.) For assuredly in the school of the Holy Ghost there is no ceasing to learn; nor was there even for Apostles. Bengel: "Nor, however, even subsequently, were the whole of the dogmas of Christian truth infused in one mass into the Apostles' minds; but as they needed them, and as occasion suggested, the Paraclete gave them instruction." The Fut. διδάξει καὶ ὑπομνήσει applies progressively to all futurity.

Therefore will we, dear readers, not scorn, in relation to babes and beginners in the school of Christ, the receiving and the keeping of even the word not understood, the τηρεῖν τὸν λόγον spoken of before, which for us all stands first as the condition. For "he who has not been the subject of an earnest desire to hear and keep the *word*, has nothing in him which the *Spirit* shall *bring to remembrance*, has nothing in him for the Spirit to set in clearer light." (Rieger.) But that all may not end with ταῦτα λελάληκα ὑμῖν—it is for us to *permit the Spirit to teach us again* all which Jesus has taught, that the seed may attain its full growth, that we may be properly mindful of both the known and the neglected sayings, letting them bear the right fruit in the right place, in living intelligence and obedience, and bearing our living testimony to their power.—The blessed disciples appear so far to have understood the great promise of ver. 26, that they are preparatorily encouraged with regard to the obscurity of these as well as all the sayings of the Lord, and thus they *ask no more questions;* when in ch. xvi. 16 they are tempted to do so once more, they bethink themselves and suppress the desire.

Ver. 27. Probably after a short pause which allowed them time to reflect upon the consoling promises referring to the Holy Ghost, the Lord proceeds further with the *farewell* which had already begun in the λελάληκα παρ' ὑμῖν μένων. As at the final conclusion, ch. xvi. 33, He speaks of *peace;* this parallel shows us that He connects a very full meaning with this word, even as we are assured, independently of that, that our Lord never uttered a word as a mere formula or phrase, or used expressions half emptied of their meaning. But we know also by many ex-

amples that He by no means scorns to adopt the usual forms of conversation in life: He elevates them to His own level, illustrates their original truth, or sets them in a new light. This makes it probable to us that we shall find in His departing discourses some such *glorification of a popular farewell greeting*, an *adieu* spoken to the disciples. Now the "farewell" in Israel, as the greeting of love in coming and in going generally, was the שָׁלוֹם לְךָ or שָׁלוֹם לָכֶם—and we have already seen upon Matt. x. 13, Lu. x. 5, how the Lord reinstates this greeting in its true meaning. When we find, and in St John too, that the risen Lord entered the circle of the disciples with *Εἰρήνη ὑμῖν* (comp. *χαίρετε*, Matt. xxviii. 9, but Lu. xxiv. 36, *εἰρήνη* also)—it is very obvious that we must connect this, as the Lord Himself designed, with the שָׁלוֹם לָכֶם which He had spoken as His departing farewell. Gesenius, indeed, to whom Lücke appeals, is quite right in saying that this formula is not yet found in the Old Testament as a *mere* greeting, as it was afterwards among the Arabians and Syrians, and in the Talmud, but always has an emphatic meaning in it, as the actual invocation of good upon a person, exhortation not to fear, etc.; but the reason of this is partly that nothing of the conventional language of conversation is there communicated, and partly that such phraseology was formed and fixed in *later* days, established, however, in the time of Christ. If it be said that the expression never occurs, at least, as a *farewell*, it may be replied that any greeting may be so used, especially such as circumstances make peculiarly suitable. Moreover, we may compare (with Lücke) as certainly the *germ* of such farewell-formula the O. T. לְךָ לְשָׁלוֹם as early as Gen. xliii. 23; Ex. iv. 18, and again 1 Sam. i. 17, xx. 42; 2 Kings v. 19; בְּשָׁלוֹם, 1 Sam. xxix. 7; 2 Sam. xv. 9, with which such passages in the New Testament as Mar. v. 34; Lu. vii. 50, viii. 48; Acts xvi. 36; Jas. ii. 16 well agree, and even in the Epistles, 1 Pet. v. 14; 3 Jno. 15. Thus we have on the whole ground enough for taking the expression *Εἰρήνην ἀφίημι ὑμῖν* in our Lord's lips as *first of all* a Valete or Farewell. Luther: "These are the last words, as of one who is going away and gives his good-night or his blessing."

But how is this touching expression, reduced in the world to an empty word and become a lie, *glorified* into its highest truth!

The New Testament εἰρήνη has been seldom profoundly enough traced to its Old Testament derivation in שָׁלוֹם, whose place it takes; it is too generally limited to the ordinary meaning of peace. Herder reduced our precious saying, *My peace* I give unto you —into the assurance that "with His mind (His Spirit!) they should also have that imperturbable *tranquillity of spirit* which they had ever seen in Him, and now discerned even in this time of distress"[1]—but our readers will hardly approve of this or think it enough. Kling, too (S. u. K. 1836. 3. 685), falls, though with a good intention, somewhat into this tone: "After He had consoled them as it regards their hitherto defective *knowledge*, He proceeds to tell them that their *temper and feelings* also should lack no stay when He had gone." He takes εἰρήνη more definitely than Lücke, as "the good estate of a mind united with God." We think, on the other hand, that this is by no means enough, but merely its *internal* aspect, the essential ground, indeed, and beginning of the Messiah's *salvation*, which we with Lücke understand to be signified. Not merely here trouble and fear, but in ch. xvi. 33, θλίψις too forms the antithesis. Luther hits the point with perfect correctness: "No man has peace unless things are with him as they should be. Therefore in the Hebrew tongue this little word *peace* means nothing else but *thriving and prospering*." In fact this is the root and ground-meaning of שָׁלוֹם, as appears plain in many passages, especially in that normal one, Isa. liii. 5. We repeat what has been said in another place.[2] שָׁלוֹם is originally the adjective form גָּדוֹל of the root שׁלם, integrum esse; whence שָׁלֵם, thus, unhurt, *whole*, *entire*, when a thing is what it should be according to its origin and capacity, without any deduction, need, sickness, hurt, unhappiness, or disturbance. Hence שִׁלֵּם to complete, restore, replace that which is wanting to a thing. This fundamental meaning of שָׁלוֹם (Cocceii Lex. incolumitas, res salvæ, pax, in quâ est ὁλοκληρία, comp. Gen. xliv. 17, Ex. iv. 18, LXX.) is here—Isa. liii.—distinctively intended, as is proved by the parallel with נִרְפָּא and חֲלִינוּ נָשָׂא. Compare שָׁלוֹם as *healing*, Jer. vi. 14, viii. 11, xiv. 17–19, xxxiii. 6–9; Ps. xxxviii. 4–8, as completeness (building), Ezek. xiii. 10–16. But let us not be misunderstood! We

[1] Bahrdt also uses the unhappy word *tranquillity of mind*.
[2] Andeutungen für gl. Schriftv. ii. 113.

would not deny by all this that the peace, or the rest of *the heart*, and conscience *through* the peace or the atonement, restored fellowship *with God*, as it afterwards appears in apostolical teaching, is an essential element, yea, as before said, the first ground and beginning of all εἰρήνη; but we must maintain that this word, which has come from the sacred idiom of the old covenant, embraces more than this, even the whole *salvation* of man, his *re-establishment* into final perfect external and internal *well-being*.[1] Hence we are really referred to eternity for the enjoyment of the consummate peace. If here the Lord in His farewell *attaches* His word to the common greeting (which certainly itself speaks, with the same generality, of well-being), He also proceeds to refer to the *Messianic promise*, according to which שָׁלוֹם in all the depth and fulness of the word is the good and salvation which the Prince of peace gives in His kingdom of peace. It was, indeed, long before the Apostles and His disciples, before the whole church of His believers should enjoy this full and perfect peace; but the pledge meanwhile, yea, in a certain sense, the compensation for it is assuredly the *inward peace* of a heart no longer disturbed or fearful, because united with God. Therefore He speaks of that *immediately*, and that is the truth in the first-named exposition, which does not however exhaust the further-pointed promissory meaning of the word. At the final return of the Lord to His own, of which the return of the risen Saviour was a type, when they altogether *live* as and where He liveth, will the *peace be unto you* be fulfilled in all its amplitude.

My peace—this also means very much: The peace which I Myself have, which I already possess in My suffering way as pledge and equivalent, because I am going to the Father into the peace and blessedness of glory; which hence I alone can give; which in its truth and fulness is actually something altogether new, and first brought unto men by Me; which, finally, I can give and impart only through fellowship with Myself, to all in whom I dwell and abide. (Comp. *My joy in you*, ch. xv. 11.) Yet let us take notice that the Lord adds this τὴν ἐμήν first to the second clause with δίδωμι; and learn therefrom that the first *peace* without the article with its ἀφίημι cannot possibly be the same.

[1] Luthardt, correctly: Εἰρήνη is not a matter of feeling, pre-eminently, but a *condition*.

He who takes the two clauses as only parallel formulæ does not interpret aright, for what the Lord already *leaves behind* Him cannot be at the same time *given*—that is, if we take as we must the δίδωμι as a δώσω belonging to the promise of the Spirit. Lange would make it a mere repetition of the farewell salutation as at the same time an assurance of permanent fellowship and speedy meeting again; but that issues in the end in such a two-fold meaning as must *here*, by the nature of the case, have a special significance. So with Lampe: He not only speaks twice about peace, but with a difference. For concerning the former peace He only speaks generally, the latter He precisely names *His own;* He leaves the *former*, the latter He gives. But not with the distinction of Augustin and Gregory: The former the peace of grace upon earth, the latter the peace of glory in heaven. Nor *merely*, as Lampe rejecting this, prefers—first, the lesser peace of the Old Testament, then the full New Testament peace. There is indeed something of truth in this, if we place ourselves in the position of the disciples as coming from the Old Testament, and the antithetical *My* almost leads that way; nevertheless, the disciples had also already received through Jesus a certain elevation of the Old Testament spiritual experience or peace of heart; and what they now had He leaves to them undisturbed and unchanged by His departure. It is at least not His fault, He would say, if they let this peace be disturbed, it ought and it might *remain* with them. Fikenscher: "Jesus took not away the repose of His disciples with Him"—but less correctly again: "He *gave* them rather (better, He promised to give) of *His* peace." He then excellently expounds, "He of you who feels himself blessed in Me, shall not lose his peace; no, I will still give to you through My Spirit, who will come to you, of *that* peace which is to be the peculiar possession of the righteous and of those called by God unto glory." Let us reflect, finally, that this gradation for the disciples is still repeated among believers, when their hearts are troubled first, and then the Lord comes to them again in His Spirit; and that interpretation of the difference between the *leaving* and the *giving* is right and important, which Fresenius gives: The first and lesser degree is the peace which is left, when the principle of the Divine peace which we had previously received from

Him is not given up in the time of pressure and trial, but held firm in the heart. The higher degree is when the peace of Jesus with a sensible joy of the Holy Ghost is truly and properly given *anew*.

Not as the world giveth! This is an affectionate ratification of the word. Kling is right in maintaining (after Lampe) that this καθώς (as) must be referred not to the substance of the peace, but to the *manner of giving* it; for this suits the letter of the expression. That the world has its peace and even *gives* it, is given to be understood only in mournful irony. It *heals the hurt* lightly (mark again the fundamental idea of שָׁלוֹם) and says peace, peace, when there is no peace. (Jer. vi. 14, viii. 11, xiv. 13, xxiii. 17; Ezek. xiii. 10.) *Its* greetings and good wishes are *empty forms of speech* without any actual giving. Its peace secured by policy and arms is not really such, as the old proverb runs—Public peace is not to be trusted. Still less the world's peace of heart. Their deluded tranquillity is followed again by the outbreak of anguish; with all their giving of peace there is no security against amazement and fear of heart. But the Lord alone adds to His שָׁלוֹם in full truth the אַל תִּירָא or אַל תִּירְאוּ which so often accompanies the word in the Old Testament.[1] Bengel refers the μὴ ταρασσέσθω to any terror from without, δειλιάτο to fears from within (comp. 2 Cor. vii. 5)—but this will not very well agree with ver. 1, where certainly internal disquiet was intended. Thus it is better to understand a progression, the former being the less, the latter the greater trouble; since δειλία, still more than φόβος, always stands with a bad meaning. Ye need not even be disquieted, if ye have My peace; much less need ye be amazed. Or, further, the δειλιᾷν is the ground of the ταρασσέσθαι, and as such is removed.

By this, *His* εἰρήνη, the Lord, who had already spoken of the difference between the *world* and His disciples, now gives the last most sure and perfectly decisive *note* of this distinction: His own have peace in Him (although because of their infirmity and before the consummation they have tribulation in the world)—

[1] Luthardt corrects Kling and myself: "It is not that the reality and the *empty word* are here opposed, but the truth and the *deceitful appearance* of peace." As if both were not the same, as we have said above! This is hairsplitting for the sake of correction.

and this may finally be made by every man a most internal test. Indeed, it is one thing to have this inmost peace, and it is another to have a joyful sense or knowledge of it; as we see in the case of these disciples to whom the Lord ascribes a peace almost in spite of themselves. Nevertheless, there was a peace which the world did not and could not give in the hearts of Mary and John under the cross, or they could not have been there. The peace of God in Christ is higher than all understanding, *ὑπερέχουσα πάντα νοῦν*, higher than all *words* about it, and deeper than all *consciousness* of it. As the power of the peace-giving of Jesus among the disciples followed and overcame all at a *later* time, so it is often with ourselves; that is, if we, like the sincere disciples, are among those to whom the thrice-uttered word was given. *To you* I leave and give peace. The leaving is always followed by the giving, as Lange says, "Out of the farewell salutation soon springs a new resurrection greeting."

Ver. 28. With that marvellous elevation of *His* peace above the amazement of these perplexed and weak-believing disciples which pervades these farewell discourses, and is here especially prominent, He demands from them that they even *rejoice* at His going away. More strictly speaking, He does not require it of them, because He knows what is in their hearts, but He *tells* them, in order that such a transcendent word may in some degree at least assuage their sorrow, that they would rejoice *if they loved Him* aright! Oh, how must this have penetrated their hearts! That they love Him He knows, He already assumed it in vers. 15, 21, 23, confirms it again down to chap. xvi. 27—and yet now He says *εἰ ἠγαπᾶτε* instead of the previous *ἐὰν ἀγαπᾶτε*. This is not hard of solution: Their love is not yet the true and perfect love, it is not yet *disinterested* enough in its faith and dependence upon His person; they still think too much of their own bereaved condition, instead of elevating themselves to His joy, which all His words however testify, and thinking upon *His* departure *to the Father*. So far we agree with Kling, that in our Lord's meaning they should rejoice at this *pre-eminently on His own account:*—what Lücke objects has not much force. The connection with ver. 27 is regarded as not permitting this sense, and *ἐχάρητε ἄν* is repre-

sented as being only the positive expression of μὴ ταρασσέσθω μηδὲ δειλιάτω. But the connection with the previous verse is really that of a *progression*, by which He would *elevate* them above themselves and their own fate to the consideration of His own glorification; and, again, neither was the trouble of the disciples *merely* on their own account, nor finally does the Lord require it of them that they rejoice exclusively on His.

Ye have indeed *heard* that I *said* unto you—a stronger expression than the simple *I say unto you;* for He would thereby intimate that they had not yet heard it aright. In the consolatory καὶ ἔρχομαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς immediately joined to the mournful ὑπάγω, He sums up, as it were, the several promises of vers. 3, 18, 21, 23. All this consequently would be cause of joy *on their own account.* But this has not availed them as yet; the solitary ὑπάγω has prevented the entrance of these assurances, exciting only gloomy thoughts of death; *therefore* the Lord now suddenly turns to the application of the other side of the question—I have *further told you* that I go to the Father![1] and that must be, as for you, so especially *for Me,* something simply good and to be rejoiced in, and if ye loved Me with an absolute love ye would in the thought of My elevation at first forget yourselves. This order of thought, which to us at least is clear and certain, gives at once the true meaning of the celebrated μείζων as spoken of the Father—a word upon which the ancient and modern heretics (to use the words of Dorner after Irenæus), like base wrestlers, seize spasmodically, as if it were an individual limb of the truth.

Luther put it rightly: "Now mark that the question here treated is not as to whether and how Christ is God or man, or what His nature and essence is, whether in this He is greater or less than the Father; but He is telling them that they should not be *terrified*—and adds these words as a reason, that He is going *to the Father.* The question is not now about His being born of the Father, but of *His receiving His Father's kingdom,*

[1] We firmly believe that the omission of εἶπον before παρεύομαι sprang from a false scruple about the repetition of the word. To us, the repetition is in the highest degree appropriate in connection with the humbling ἠκούσατε. I have not merely *said* ὑπάγω, but also *I go to the Father*—that, too, ye have heard Me say.

in which He will be equal with the Father, and be known and honoured in like majesty. Therefore do I go, He saith, thither *where I shall be greater than I now am*, that is to the Father—and it is better that I should pass *out of this obscurity and weakness* (in which He moves, since He must suffer and die) into the *power and glory* in which the Father is." Similarly Calvin: "Christ does not here compare the Divinity of the Father with His own, nor His own human nature with the Divine essence of the Father; but rather His present condition with the celestial glory to which He would presently be received, as if He would say: Ye desire to retain Me in the world, though it is better for Me to ascend into heaven." So, further, Cocceius: "An inferiority as to His human nature is not here intended, because an inferiority is referred to which is to be removed by His departure to the Father."

Quite inappropriate also is all that the fathers have said, whether in opposition to heretics or without this occasion, for the closer understanding of this *greater*—referring it to a permanent relation between the Divine persons. We cannot at all see how such a thought could have arisen here.[1] *Greater than I*, who nevertheless am greater than all, One with the Father, so that He is seen in Me—this very *paradox*, which exalts Him who speaks so high, necessarily requires the explanation, the restriction "*for the present*, in a certain sense." That the saying would otherwise "say nothing" at such time, Brückner may well assert with Hilgenfeld whom he quotes. It is evident that the Son speaks in His undivided person generally; and here especially inasmuch as He now placed Himself in antithesis to the Father. To speak *in such manner* of a pre-eminence in Divine *dignity*, which would be self-understood, would not evidence humility, but be in the highest degree inappropriate. Roos: "What subject would say to His friends—Ye should rejoice because I am going to the Prince, for the Prince is greater than I?"[2] We make it stronger: What man as man would say—God is

[1] In Petavius de Trin. lib. 2, cap. 2, we have them collected: similarly in Suiceri Thesaur. Eccles. ii. 1368. Either, according to Alexander against Arius, the Father as ἀγέννητος or as Father is greater; or, the Son is less only according to His human nature, which latter Gerhard labours hard to prove.

[2] Glaubenslehre, § 237, comp. Lehre Jesu Christi, S. 176.

greater than I!![1] Thus also that is ever impossible—According to My humanity I am indeed less! Moreover, He speaks of an inferiority *to be laid aside, to be removed;* else would there be no ground for the ἐχάρητε ἄν in the whole discourse. If (as Schmieder on the High-priestly Prayer teaches) the Father is mentioned here as greater than the Son quite independently of His incarnation, and simply by reason of the character of subordination in the eternal Sonship, there can be found no connection or order of thought in this discourse on such a view. The Father *sent* Him into the world, and now in the obedience of this mission, in the *doing as the Father gave Him commandment*, ver. 31, He points to the Father in heaven as greater and above Himself. It is the status præsens of the Son compared with the Divine government of the Father—as Luthardt after Calvin maintains. This is so obvious that many fathers (Origen, Athanasius, Cyril, Epiphanius) cite the words, though they scarcely so read them, thus: ὁ πατὴρ ὁ πέμψας με or ἀποστείλας με πατήρ—without rightly noting what this involved. Not so much "as opposed to the suffering and dying Son of man"—although this touches the kernel of the matter—but the Father is already greater when compared with the *Son*, as He is *now* the emptied and humiliated Son of man, and that means certainly, first of all, as Kling very properly says—Higher, more glorious, *mightier;* ch. x. 29, is decisive for this meaning. That a *beatior* is also included, as Bengel, Storr, and others assert, is true, but only as a *deduction* suited to the connection; for μέγας, μείζων in itself has no such meaning—although וַיִּגְדַּל, Gen. xxvi. 13, has been strangely quoted to prove it. The departure of the Son to the Father, into the full fellowship of His might and glory, is an exaltation; and at that they should rejoice. The Son so speaks, as Bengel expresses it—Ut filius Dei in carne *ad Patrem tendens.* But this was intended as it et captui illi, quem discipuli tum habebant, et temporis reique præsenti, quum de perfectione ad Patrem agebatur, erat accommodatissimum,—so that any deeper reference to the relations of essence between Father and Son are not to be sought for here.[2]

[1] "A mere man could least of all have said this concerning himself." Brandt.

[2] Liebner's speculations (Christologie i. 150 ff.) about an eternal κένωσις

We have recognised from the outset that the Lord would have His disciples rejoice pre-eminently *on His* own account, because He was going to the Greater, to become Himself once more great and high; we gladly admit, with Olshausen, "the exceeding delicacy of thought by which the Lord appeals to the love which they bear *Him* for *their own consolation*: ye love Me, then rejoice that I go to the Father, for it is good for *Myself*." But, nevertheless, in order not to be one-sided, we must admit what indeed preceded in καὶ ἔρχομαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς, that the Lord does not speak as if He would exclude them—It is expedient *for you* that I go away, ch. xvi. 7. Both meanings lie, finally, in the word, that the Father is greater. The first obvious deduction is, I Myself shall be exalted—the next, And will send from the Father the Comforter, work mightily in you, and give effect to your prayers, yea, come again Myself in life and glory. Lampe also decides for gaudium discipulorum tum Christi, tum sui causâ. Here, again, not as Stolz says: "God can better protect you than My visible presence;" and, Lücke, alas, "The Father is a more mighty protection!" For this postponement of the Son, who goeth to the Father (as if He were to *continue* less!), is rationalistic, and opposes the substance generally of these farewell discourses. Assuredly the disciples were to expect, not from the greater Father according to this distinction, but actually from the Son gone to Him, and then alike great, consolation, salvation, and power, yea, all that He had promised to them; and that is very much more than mere *protection!*

of the Son even in the Trinity, have no exegetical point of connection with our present text, and belong to the μυστήριον ἐνδιάθετον of an "eternal God-man" which the Scripture nowhere directly affirms—and with which we would now have nothing to do. Just so, Olshausen sinks too deep, falling back almost upon the ἀγέννητος and γέννητος again, in the thought, inappropriate here, that the Father being the ground of the Son, therefore the return to the Father was the satisfaction of the *longing* of the Son, who yearned for His original. This might previously lie in the undertone of the πρὸς τὸν πατέρα, but it is wrong to say—"this is the relation of the Son to the Father which is indicated by the words μείζων μου ἐστί." Similarly, but more prudently, v. Gerlach: "as long as the Son of God by reason of His voluntary humiliation was *less* than the Father, He pressed upwards struggling and suffering to His *original*." Why not, rather, what he himself continues with—to His *glorification*, re-exaltation?

More correctly Luther: "I go to My glory for your sakes too, and enter My kingdom where I can protect and *help* you, against *all* that can hurt."[1]

Ver. 29. Just as in ch. xiii. 19. Hence we may, generally, supplement *ye might believe* by ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι—or understand the πιστεύειν εἰς αὐτόν required from them at the beginning. This must be taken as August. Tract. 79 remarks: non fide novâ, sed auctâ, aut certe, cum mortuus esset, defectâ, cum resurrexisset, refectâ. Yet in speaking after this manner the Lord scarcely admits their present faith to be faith, just as in the case of their love. *What* was it that He told them before it came to pass? This we have not to seek, with Lücke, in the previous promises, ver. 26 to wit; but it refers immediately to the *going to the Father* and the *coming again;* of course, however, including all that is bound up with these truths.

Ver. 30. He will no longer speak *much* to them, thus yet a little more—evidence of what was previously asserted that He well knew that He would not yet altogether cease and break off. The way to the Father leads, for the Son of man and for the redemption of mankind, through death, through the suffering of death; but in this Satan is the ruling proximate agent, with whom therefore He first has to do. Mark once more the perpetual variation of the highest opposites in the clear and tranquil consciousness of Jesus: from the glory of the Almighty Father in heaven He turns to the devil's power of darkness upon earth, among men. He perfectly well knows His way and His task. The *prince of the world*[2] comes in hostile attack upon Him,—by no means *merely* through men in whom he lives and works, as Tholuck says, "the spirit of darkness working in My enemies."[3] This is included, but is certainly not all; for Lu. xxii. 53 does not give us two parallel sayings, but *distinguishes* the still more strongly marked power of darkness (in which He had already struggled with death and the prince of death, ver. 44), from

[1] His Pentecost sermon in Niethammer.

[2] Τούτου is not genuine, but derived from the parallels, chs. xii. 31, xvi. 11.

[3] Many even refer it to Judas, who was just returning—See, there cometh Satan!! Schleiermacher is much too bold—All those who stand up against Me will fail to fasten a spot of guilt upon Me!

their hour. The *soul-sufferings* of Christ, as they were from without, came upon Him from the influence and assault of Satan: this is a truth which has always been certain in orthodox faith. Here He encounters the second greater temptation, now through fear and horror as the first time through pleasure and desire.[1] But the Lord is beforehand assured of His victory in the final, decisive conflict with the enemy; He knows that the mighty one must become impotent against Himself, *because he hath nothing* in Him. "Thus He comforts and encourages Himself against the injurious devil."—(Luther.)

Is ἐν ἐμοί to be taken as standing simply for εἰς ἐμέ? Is οὐκ ἔχει οὐδέν to be explained merely of might? Thus scil. ποιεῖν, he can do nothing against Me, *hath nothing over Me?* For this, ἐν αὐτῷ, Matt. xvii. 12, and ἔχειν ποιῆσαι, Lu. xii. 4, are compared. We confidently think otherwise, for this mere assurance that the devil could do nothing further against Him is here in the mouth of our Lord too little; and the *in Me*, taken with the mere *hath*, is plainly enough to be understood in its most simple and obvious meaning. Lange: no point of seizure. We could not at once adopt Lampe's nihil neque *juris* neque *virium*. For this last—no *power*—is not plainly spoken, but left to be deduced, for the ἐν ἐμοί gives the reason for the εἰς ἐμέ which is not at first added. Let the sublime antithesis be observed, in which the Lord opposes *Himself* alone to the whole κόσμος. Wherefore is Satan, as having the power of death, the lord of all humanity? Wherefore but because of sin? Where he finds guilt he has a claim, consequently a power. Just *that* is the point of seizure. According to this correct and scriptural thought, which applies here if anywhere, the ancients supplemented the plain words ἐν ἐμοὶ οὐκ ἔχει οὐδέν by the correct τὶ τῶν ἰδίων. Nonnus, concisely and well, μέρος. August. Tract. 79: nullum omnino scilicet peccatum; which coincides at bottom with Euthymius' αἴτιον θανάτου. The same was signified by the varr. readings and glosses, εὑρήσει, εὑρίσκει, and so forth. The καί between the two clauses is certainly adversative, and we might waver between this view,—*But* he has nothing, will find nothing in Me, which is of his own, and which could

[1] We may refer to our notes in Hebräerbrief i. 49. These renounced truths we cannot be ever anew investigating and establishing.

give him right and power over Me—and the other, He *cometh* upon Me, *although* He has no authority to do so. We prefer the latter, because that makes the following ἀλλά plain.

Ver. 31. The construction is here again dubious. Grotius, whom Paulus and Kuinoel follow, would understand the καί as propterea, making it introduce the minor in the argument; but this is too artificial and inappropriate to need any refutation. But should we not, however, with Bengel, set the period after ποιῶ? Then should we supplement it—*But he cometh*, nevertheless, on Me, the Father permitteth that, and I bear it, yea, it is the Father's will and I obey it—that thereby the world through the knowledge of My love and My obedience may be saved, or its salvation rendered possible. This is in any case the meaning of the *But*, which solves *the mystery of his coming who nevertheless hath nothing in Him;* inasmuch as no construction changes this sense—I give Myself up voluntarily and obedient for the good of the world. Meanwhile, the ellipsis after ἀλλά, much more *between* ἀλλά and ἵνα, is very harsh; and besides that the sudden *setting out* as a clause of itself is too abrupt. Therefore we hold with the ancients who make the ἐγείρεσθε depend on the preceding clause, and thus refer the ἀλλά itself to the breaking off summons. Nevertheless, not, with Lücke—*Be it so* then (for he has not rightly understood the previous ἐν ἐμοί)—but, giving it still the adversative meaning, *But he cometh* nevertheless, I suffer him to come against Me, I go Myself to meet him; and *instead of that* spoken in common (we shall soon see why)—Let *us* go to meet him!

The *world* is to know the love of the Son to the Father by His obedience; wherefore not rather the love of the Father and the Son to it, the world? This would be more obvious, but the striking application instead of it is strictly in harmony with the profound view which makes everything here rest upon the relation of the Father and the Son. Yea, the voluntary obedience of Christ, which in the bitter sufferings of death so strongly attested itself, not enforced but springing solely from *love*, is the first thing which the world is to know, before knowing all which springs from it. The love *to the Father* is the perfect consent of His will to His gracious counsel to redeem thereby the world; this is the ground and substance of the ἐνετείλατο. The ἐντολή

of the Father was before spoken of in ch. x. 18 and xii. 49. Always to the end does the Son repose in this supreme Δεῖ—it is ever "a *mystery*: the Father wills it! Wherefore? This he tells us not." (Joh. v. Müller.) Enough, that if the world knoweth the *self-surrender* of Christ in order to the accomplishment of this counsel, it may yet experience its fruit in its own salvation. Here also to this same world, whose prince Satan is, freedom and salvation are again offered with the same ἵνα as in ch. iii. 17. Bengel: that the world may cease to be the world, and savingly acknowledge the Father's good pleasure in Me.

It is, finally, equally striking with the former transition, that the Lord should include and take with Him the disciples in His *let us go* to sufferings and death. He who can reconcile himself to regard this as referring merely to their external accompanying to Gethsemane, may do so; but we find further something typical in the background. The Lord utters it for the future of *their following* in the same way of suffering and obedience, in the fellowship of His cross; and thus has the Spirit expounded this *conclusion* to the church, in many a Pentecost sermon. Such an application has its justifiable ground in the undertone of the Spirit's meaning. Hence it is not unexegetical when the Berlenb. Bibel comments: "Up! up! let us go forth to suffering and the fulfilment of the Divine will! Thus does the Lord arouse them, and carry them with Him into His contest, that they may be His followers in the way of suffering." We would add, once more, In order that (further in the future) the world may see also your love to Me in your obedience to My commands, and thereby be convinced that ye are in Me as I am in you, and recognise your commission to save by your self-sacrificing testimony all who will be saved.

RENEWED FAREWELL DISCOURSES DURING THE DELAY OF SETTING FORTH—CHS. XV. XVI. SIMILITUDE OF THE VINE AND THE BRANCHES—CH. XV. 1–6.

The text rigidly requires that we interpose here—*Then they arose*, but went *not yet* forth from the place, and the Lord proceeded to speak further Every other distribution and account

of these discourses, as they are immediately linked one to another, disturbs, according to our simple and decided feeling, the irremoveable sense of the letter. St John does not "forget," in his especial attention to the discourses themselves, their scenery (as Lücke, with whom we agree in the main, rather unhappily expresses it); but the Lord's words are so entirely the great concernment that He deliberately hastens over everything external, teaching us what is the only worthy and profitable course for ourselves. Meanwhile, if we, not elevated to so lofty a point as he, require a "scenery" in the midst of which we may better hear our Lord's words, there are sufficient intimations here for its construction. We may suppose that the disciples obeyed the *Arise* as soon as it was spoken, and (as the *Let us go* renders highly probable) that the Lord Himself arose; had they, however, actually gone forth, the Evangelist would certainly have said so in a simple word. Thus, not to mention the harmonising which would interpose here the going into the town, the passover and the supper, we cannot admit even the old and customary supposition that all which now follows was uttered after the setting forth, and *in the way*.[1] For in ch. xviii. 1 we have the ἐξῆλθε express, which as related to ch. xiv. 31, cannot possibly intimate the departure only "outside the town-boundaries" (as Lange maintains against myself,—what significance would these limits have here?); besides which, we cannot imagine how the Lord could have uttered these most confidential final sayings in the open air, amid the crowds which we must assume at the feast time—the last prayer especially requiring a secluded and undisturbed place. The Lord begins anew to speak, while still in the room of the paschal meal, on the point of departure, and surrounded by His disciples. His words are still more penetrating and affecting: first, concerning the permanent bond of love between Him and them, then, in more specific reference to

[1] Instead of which Chrysos. (see in Klee) supposed that the Lord led away His disciples, troubled about the *place* where they had been, to another place; that so regarding themselves more safe they might better hear the remainder! Very much might be urged in objection to this. It requires a poetical expounder like Lange to devise a going forth under the starry heavens at ch. xiv. 2—(after an "exit from the room" between chs. xiii. and xiv., of which there is no hint)—and then for ch. xv. to discover not only vines around but burning fires also in the garden.

His farewell, concerning all that would follow after and result from His departure.[1] See our distribution of the whole at the outset. Well, then, My way is unto death and separation from you—but we are and we shall remain united for ever. *As ye surround Me now*, in faith and in love hanging already on Me, so shall it be and much more, our unity shall be truly internal—I the Vine, ye the branches. What a majestic *Ἐγώ* once more at this head of the new discourse!

And now as to the *occasion* for this selected similitude? We must at once set aside Tholuck, who maintains without any ground that Christ *everywhere* derived the similitudes which He employed from *something which met His eyes;* and Hezel, who says that He *always* took occasion from the matters of common life which were before Him at the time. It is not difficult to contradict this "everywhere" and "always" by sure examples; and, furthermore, it seems to us petty and unworthy to suppose that the Lord would restrict Himself always to things sensibly present, while He had before His eyes and at His command the whole treasure of the types and symbols of the kingdom of heaven which had been impressed upon all nature at the creation, and which had been already abundantly illustrated in the ancient Scriptures. Nor was the weakness or the dulness of the disciples so great as to render this necessary on their account. There was no need that vines should be clustering round the window, or that vineyards should have been passed through on the road, or that the room should be decorated with vine foliage (all which have been assumed), to account for the Lord's choice of the figure. It is perfectly out of keeping to introduce the artificial vine on the door of the temple (Joseph. Bell. Jud. 5, 5, 4, Arch. 15, 11, 3), which Lampe refers to with *forte quoque*, and Rosenmüller insisted on. Although this vine, intended (as Olshausen remarks) to be a type of Israel, might seem to be an anticipatory prophecy of that which our Lord's words here teach, yet *now* and *in this place* a designed allusion to such shadows in the forsaken temple is quite inappropriate. When the Lord now

[1] Thus correctly, *e.g.*, the Hirschb. Bibel, v. Gerlach, Pfenninger, Knapp, Tholuck, Olshausen, Lücke, Klee. The Berlenb. Bibel: "Here Christ paused a while and contemplated His disciples, to see how they breathed after His words. Then follow other discourses."

begins to speak of a *vine*, His language is in harmony with the whole system of the sacred language of figures (for as to this the "everywhere" and "always" holds good in every figure)—but its connection with that system has at least a twofold, probably a threefold, foundation. The two certain and related grounds are *nature* in itself, and the *prophetic phraseology* which interprets nature; the third is introduced by the recently instituted *supper*. The vine is one of the most significant emblems in nature, immediately illustrating that interpretation of its mystery, which here reaches its culmination: its stock and stem unsightly, but vigorous, beautiful, richly spreading in its foliage, and moreover bearing the noblest, the most generous of all fruits (Judg. ix. 13; Ps. civ. 15)—the top and crown of herbs of the field, the grape the end of the year as the violet its beginning—requiring much toil and care, its wood useless independently of the fruit—and whatever else may be observed in this hieroglyphic of nature. *Therefore* also in the Old Testament the vine spreading widely from its root and stem, vigorously putting forth its new branches, is a type of fruitful growth generally (Ezek. xvii. 6, xix. 10)—and then specially a figure of Israel,—and finally and prophetically, even of the Messiah and His people, as shadowed in then existing Israel. We know how the Lord Jesus unfolded His vineyard-parable taken from Jer. v. in Matt. xxi. But we must also remember the individual vine by the fig-tree, Joel i. 7 (Hos. ix. 10), Jer. ii. 21.[1] Finally, Israel is in Ps. lxxx. 15–18, a type of the Son of man, whom the Lord as His Son planted and made strong for Himself, thus of the Messiah and of all who belong to Him. All this was fore-prepared in the prophetical phraseology, intimating a new planting after the destruction of the old; so that Luthardt may rightly say, "Since God was constrained to give His vineyard up to ruin, He separated for Himself this vine, and designed it to be a new beginning from which a great increase should take its rise."[2] Moreover, vines

[1] Where, however, the ἀλήθινός of the Sept. has quite another sense than here in St John, and has been very confusedly brought into comparison.

[2] This is more scriptural, and more in harmony with the Old Testament view than that of Schleiermacher: "Human nature, before the Redeemer's manifestation, was the wild vine; and if He had not come, the noble and beautiful fruit which human nature was to bear in the garden of the Lord would never have been produced."

were so familiar a sight to the Israelites generally, even round about Jerusalem and upon the sides of their houses (Ps. cxxviii. 3), that our Lord needed no specific object to point His allusion here. Putting all this together, then, how natural was this similitude, especially just after the institution of the supper had given the highest consecration to the symbol of the vine! This last point of connection is made prominent by Grotius, and after him Nösselt, Knapp, etc.; and we do not deny the full force of the idea; but we must contend against the *exclusive* reference to the sacrament as too individualised, and maintain that the Lord was constrained, as it were, to "make choice" of the wine in the institution—to use their unhappy word—on account of the entire symbolism of Scripture and nature, which should here find its great solution. We may indeed say with Ebrard that the vine-similitude which now follows declares the "true meaning of the sacrament"—and reassert, what has been more than once intimated, that St John's Gospel gives us this discourse concerning the inmost essence of the sacrament instead of the historical narration of its institution.[1] Bread and wine are co-related (even in nature, Ps. civ. 14, 15), as the flesh and blood in man's personality; hence Christ is the bread of life, the *corn of wheat* in the general, inasmuch as from His *body* and life the church is nourished, yea derives its original existence, but as He gives His life to death for that purpose, and in His blood makes us especially partakers thereof, He is also the *vine*. The juice of the grape, the juice of stem and branches generally which is to be glorified, as it were, into a spirituous energy, is, according to the profound phraseology of Scripture—which has its classical analogies in the *αἷμα βοτρύων* of Ach. Tatius, the sanguis terræ of Pliny, the uvarum frigidus sanguis of Cassiodorus—the *blood* and *life* of the noble plant; and hence the expressions of Gen. xlix. 11; Deut. xxxii. 14; 1 Macc. vi. 34; Isa. lxiii. 2, comp. Rev. xix. 13, 15, etc. This was one blood, one sap, one life to circulate in the true branches of the true vine:—and here we have a broad and deep foundation in nature and Scripture for

[1] But this must not be taken as Herder strangely put it: "The Evangelist *might not* introduce the misused symbol of the sacrament which had been (by perversion at first?!) incorporated into Christianity; but instead of that he unfolded most expressly its true *significance*."

the so-called "similitude," while the sacrament was its point of immediate connection. Pfenninger's poetical notion, however, is too far-fetched, that the disciples might have asked, on account of Lu. xxii. 18, "Lord, when shall we drink again with Thee the fruit of the vine?" and that now the answer came,—For the present and till then I am Myself the Vine, from which ye are to derive as branches the sap of your nourishment and life!

The discourse of the vine and the branches is full of gracious promise, but it is also hortatory, and even warning in its tone (vers. 1–4); it gives such strong encouragement and so convincingly humbles at the same time, that it may be employed as a Gospel for Advent, as well as for the text of specifically evangelical sermons of penitence and confession. "What the Apostles afterwards taught with regard to our *justification* as well as our *sanctification* being derived from our *being in Christ*—are all truths taken from these discourses of our Lord." (Rieger.) The more exact disposition of the whole, especially down to ver. 17, where a new element is introduced, we have already given.[1] Vers. 1–6 embrace the preparatory similitude in itself, though developed already into its signification. The proper subject of the figure precedes in vers. 1, 2; there is then interposed an unfigurative clause, ver. 3 (reminding of the feet-washing), in order to lead the way to an intenser repetition, going beyond the figure in *καθώς* and *ποιεῖν οὐδέν*—I am the Vine, ye are the branches! Then comes the unfigurative discourse:—the *abiding in Him*, that is, in His *love*, vers. 7–10; and once more, as standing in the midst of all, the word concerning *joy*, ver. 11; and then on the ground of this the most precise development of that *friendship* with Him who laid down His life for them, to which they are chosen and appointed, vers. 12–17.

Ver. 1. This is the normal passage for the illustration of the so-called Johannaean meaning of the word *ἀληθινός*. As in St John *ἀλήθεια* very frequently indicates not merely what we call in current language truth, but essential reality—whether

[1] B.-Crusius disposes otherwise this entire chapter, after the logical arrangement of bad sermons: How the disciples are to walk after His departure—as it regards Him, vers. 1–11; one another, vers. 12–17; the world, ver. 17 to the end.

of things answering to their types, fulfilment consummating prophecy, accomplishment completing preparation—so likewise is ἀληθινόν the true and genuine, that which is real and proper in the full truth of its word and idea. Hence the true light, ch. i. 9—the genuine worshippers, ch. iv. 23—the true bread from heaven, ch. vi. 32. In full protest against the inadequate view which would make the material production of the earth which bears this name the "real" vine, our Lord testifies, and His meaning alone gave the Evangelist his Greek word, that He Himself is *the real, the essential* Vine. This is not in opposition to a false, spurious, degenerate growth, as in Jer. ii. 21, זֶרַע אֱמֶת[1] —nor (as Braune thinks) to the artificial imitation of a vine on the gate of the temple. But it would say, The vine in nature is only a figure and symbol pointing to and prophesying of Me; just so Israel as God's vine in the prophets is only an imperfect type; but the full reality of all that these figures of nature and Scripture indicate is found in Me as the second Adam, as the root and stem from which My people derive their growth and life, and produce their fruit. Yes, verily, in virtue of His *human* nature, as Augustin rightly remarked, Christ is to the world such a vine, the root and stem of a new fruit-bearing life:[2] and therefore He goes on to speak of the *Father* who sent and implanted Him in humanity. This is the truth, and not what Lange says of the "eternal Vine in the midst of the world and humanity—whose shoots *men* are in their relation to Him—whose roots in the life of the *Logos* pervade the ground and soil of the whole world." As it respects the individual expressions here used, it has been usually remarked that γεωργός is used in classical writers specifically for ἀμπελουργός, and husbandman for vine-dresser; and this cannot be denied. (Hence we have even γεωργεῖν with such a limitation in Plato, with τὴν ἄμπελον in Achill. Tat., and often in the writers on husbandry with οἶνον.) Further, that γεωργός, as distinguished from γεωπόνος, does not so much indicate the labouring servant as the owner of the land, the lord who manages his own property.[3]

[1] Which Ebrard adduces, and also without authority places in the original of Isa. xxvii. 2.

[2] Nonnus well says, ἐγὼ παλινναυξεῖ κόσμῳ ζωῆς ἄμπελός εἰμι.

[3] Lampe referred to Philo's Comment. on Gen. ix. 20.

In all this thus much is true, that the γεωργία or cultivation of the land in general *includes* also the tillage of vines as a very important part of it, so that we accordingly speak of *cultivating* the vine, or *growing* wine; as also that the γεωργός *may be* at the same time (whether labouring himself or not labouring) the actual owner.[1] Thus here, though we would translate almost unhesitatingly with Luther "vine-dresser," it appears to us that the use of the *more general* expression (where the more specific was close at hand) points to a more general acceptation, as appears in the θεοῦ γεώργιον of 1 Cor. iii. 9; similarly, though in Lu. xiii. 7 the *subordinate labourer* is called ἀμπελουργός, we would not say that *here* God is designedly *distinguished* from such. The Father is, rather, in the highest and most proper sense the *Planter* and *Cultivator*, as the Lord of all that grows in the world, and especially in the kingdom of God; consequently in an especial manner of that very *Vine* of which the words here speak. He planted His Son as the Son of man to be the Vine which should put forth its branches, already in His birth in our flesh; but now in His death, which is itself no other than the full birth, the fructifying, the glorification of the Son of man, *He plants Him more deeply and effectually*, and makes Him that which He here says—Ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ ἄμπελος ἡ ἀληθινή. Luther's exposition, therefore, is entirely right in apprehending the meaning to be that Christ is made of the Father through the sufferings of death a vine putting forth its branches. "This is a most gracious figure. It is a tender prosopopeia in which He places before our eyes not a useless unfruitful tree, but the beautiful vine, which is indeed not precious to look upon, but bears much fruit, and yields the most gracious and sweetest juice. And He explains that all the sufferings which both He and they should encounter are no other than the diligent care and watchfulness which a vine-dresser bestows upon his vine and its branches, *that it may thrive and bear plentifully.*" It is, indeed, as if the Lord had gone on to say: Let My heavenly Father now (when the prince of this world cometh, but only as an instrument in the hands of His government) do with Me what He will, it will all turn to the

[1] See, *e.g.*, in New Testament the γεωργούς, Matt. xxi. 33, and the κοπιῶντα, 2 Tim. ii. 6.

bringing forth much fruit (ch. xii. 24). Do ye not suppose that this supreme and true γεωργός understands well how the land or the vineyard is to be cultivated? It is *fruit* which He looks for; and to that end He doeth diligently and wisely all that in Him is; first upon Me whom He has planted as a vine, or rather whom He now first is truly planting, and then also upon you and all My branches. This is the connection, and transition to the following verse.

Ver. 2. In the related parable the discourse is of an entire vineyard, but now (on the ground of those before-cited passages of the Old Testament) it is plainly brought out that the whole planting consists in one stock, from which all other growth proceeds as only a branch, and one which must abide in Him. But who is a *branch* in Christ? Exposition too often, and preaching very generally, takes a restricted view of this, limiting it to those who have been converted to Christ in conscious faith, and born again through the full impartation of the Spirit. This is manifestly wrong; for the Lord also speaks, and at the very first, of altogether unfruitful branches; we have no liberty to lower the interpretation of this *μὴ φέρον καρπόν*, which is made still stronger by the contrast with the opposite. And yet it is a *branch in Him*—there is in this something at once startling and peculiar. It may be said, indeed, that those branches are here intended which bear fruit at first, that is, give early promise of it, but by not abiding in Him—*bring no fruit to perfection.* (Lu. viii. 14.) And this is right, as appears afterwards in vers. 4–6; but these are only included, and the absolute clause, beginning the sentence, leaves something more general behind. For this is the point of the punishmemt afterwards threatened, that a branch giving good promise at first shall and must be treated similarly with one which had been unfruitful from the beginning. But the Berlenb. Bible is far too general (falling into a great oversight for once) when it says: "Christ is a Head to all men, and thus in this sense all men hang upon Him; all races upon earth have a portion in this vine, and are called to the knowledge of it. The right to it is for all." For then the *αἴρειν* must at once be referred onwards to the last judgment; whereas, being parallel with *καθαίρειν*, it belongs first of all undoubtedly to the present care and labour put forth upon the

great Vine. In the end we shall find those alone exhibited who are in some way called, and who manifestly or secretly are transposed into the second Adam in the bond of grace, thus being fitted, and under obligation, to bring forth fruit; but if we would now apply what the Lord plainly speaks for a present application, then His entirely unfruitful branches are—not so much those who have all Divine might in the *knowledge* of Him who called them, albeit they again become barren and unfruitful (2 Pet. i. 3–8, where there was a first φέρειν καρπόν); but, as our Lord plainly discloses to us in this seemingly strange saying, they exhibit to us the preparatory election and incorporation of many into a church which embraces souls from their birth, through the grace of baptism, and all the ecclesiastical communion which hangs upon it. Thus they are "Christians" especially, who have the word and sacraments, but receive them in vain; and to *these* the preacher should earnestly apply this saying! They are indeed planted in God's vineyard like that fig-tree, Lu. xiii. 6—even grafted for a beginning into the Vine.[1] Lampe, who might have learned here to correct his Reformed dogmatics, cannot but see at least that the ἐν ἐμοί is not to be severed from κλῆμα and attached to φέρον καρπόν (it is evidently assumed otherwise in the *following* καὶ πᾶν)—as, after the example of the Pesh., many have done. He falls afterward into embarrassment: etiam spurios palmites *quadantenus* concipi posse, *quasi* in Jesu sint, *supponitur;* and again, *in debiliori sensu* it may be said of those who are found merely in the external church. But here there is no *quasi;* the same real ἐν ἐμοί is a foundation for the whole. As, according to Acts xvii. 26, all nations of men have sprung from the one blood of the first Adam, so there is now a fellowship with the second Adam which is mediated by the calling word and the prevenient sacramental blessing, and which embraces in succession the nations as a whole, implanting the germ of regeneration and of growth together in a body. These are called and they are collectively branches already in Christ, although more is then required in order to their becoming (in the *stricter* similitude of

[1] For although the figure goes not expressly so far back, yet in its deepest principle Loskiel is quite right in saying—"Here only ingrafted branches can be spoken of."

the Apostle, which, as must be seen, is by no means simply parallel with this) living *members* of His true body. See, moreover, Rom. vi. 3–6, which truly holds good for the baptism of children, although in such a sense that in the case of the greater part a growing together is supposed subsequently to follow. Where it is not so, the *taking away* of the unfruitful is assuredly for the most part (though not altogether) only a manifestation of the separation from Christ which had already taken place. More will be seen upon ver. 6. The figure preserves its truth just in this its centre, the connection between the stem and the branches; although the ἐν, other than which no expression could have been employed, passes onward after a manner from the mere "on" into the more proper "in"—an interchange which Luther's translation has well preserved by the corresponding "*an*" and "*in*."

Secondly, what is the *fruit* on which all depends? We must not superficially speak immediately of good *works*, instead of seizing more internally the fruits of the Spirit, according to Gal. v. 22; nor must we too exclusively emphasize the results of external activity, by which one branch produces others. All this is indeed included, inasmuch as the Spirit's life in Christ will assuredly exhibit itself in outward works, and every living Christian does mediately or immediately, consciously or unconsciously, work to the winning of others; but the *fruit* which the Vine-dresser desires is in its general principle only the consummation and ripening of our own regeneration, as the cluster so to speak is the glorified form and complete manifestation of the virtue of the branch.

Finally, the *purging*, by which the fruit is increased, according to the capacity and obligation of the branch as deriving its vigour from the vine,—is a most important and prominent feature of the similitude, the most essential point in the diligent and wise *culture* which the vine itself needs! Everything here goes strangely against appearances. As it regards the vine-stock itself, before it puts forth its shoots, an inexperienced person might ask, For what purpose is this crooked and unsightly tree in this beautiful garden? And then the unpitying cutting away of so many shoots, seemingly so green and healthy. This has reference in part to entire branches which are worth-

less, and in part to the very best branches themselves, from which must be lopped off everything which would grow wildly into wood and leaf, to the injury of the vital energy required for the fruit. This connection is even expressed by the paronomasia between *αἴρει* and *καθαίρει* (well imitated by Lange's *abschneiden* and *beschneiden*), which is against the etymology, and of course belongs simply to St John's reproduction of the words, but must be recognised in itself. That *καθαίρειν* had been the actual term for the pruning of vines cannot be proved, but it was an obvious expression which might sometimes be used for that purpose. Thus there may be found in it a certain allusion to the state of circumcision; but the fundamental signification of the word must hold its right. The Lord did not use any such direct expression as זמר; for ver. 3 connects the *καθαροί* of His interpretation with this *καθαίρειν*, which already is a transition to unfigurative language. The noble Vine itself and in itself needed no pruning and purging, nor is the taking away of the unfruitful branches so regarded; but the fruitful branches undergo this taking away, that they may not themselves be cut off, but rather become continually more fruitful.[1] The pruning-knife of the heavenly Vine-dresser is applied to us indeed in that external tribulation and discipline which none of us can escape; nevertheless the work is done only by internal discipline, and there is, as we shall hear presently, a purification which is effected through the *word*. But before we pass on to that, we must note the expressly twofold *πᾶν*, which intimates that it is applied without respect of persons, sparing none and pretermitting none, rigid and faithful according to the vine-dressing rule which aims at fruit and the utmost possible fruit:—thus does God cultivate His vine, and rigidly prune all its branches. Without respect of persons—we may well say, for in this *παροιμία* concerning living branches, which are free to abide in the vine or not, which must be *cleansed*, and to whom the *word* is spoken, the figure and its interpretation pass one into the other from the beginning. Hence in ver. 3 a simple *unfigurative* word is interposed, in order to lay the foundation for the *mixed* figure and interpretation in vers. 4–6.

[1] Bengel: Quodsi auferri a te quæ mala sunt nolis, auferre te ipsum oportebit.

Ver. 3. Even the Apostles, whom now the direct address takes out from among the many branches contemplated in ver. 2, *were* by nature *not* clean or not capable of that fruit which the Father now expects from His vine; but their connection with Christ established through their first faith has made them branches: and that is their first fundamental purity. The Lord undeniably recalls to their remembrance the words of ch. xiii. 10; but the word on account of or through which[1] they had become clean, is not generally "any single word of the Lord in which there could have been salvation." (Schleierm.) —Therefore not that assurance given at the feet-washing—but the whole of the words of His discourse with them, which they had received in faith. The λελάληκα which so often in these discourses presupposes a close and departure, does not hinder us from including all the other words which nevertheless followed down to ch. xvi. 27, 33. Olshausen says rightly that ὁ λόγος is here quite the same as τὰ ῥήματα, ver. 7—with which also ch. xvii. 6, 8 may be compared. Since ἤδη καθαροί apparently contradicts the previous καθαίρειν, as if this latter were now unnecessary, it drives us to a deeper understanding of these relative expressions, with their only hinted meanings; but the Spirit brings us to this understanding in living knowledge and experience. The καθαροί ἐστε retains, according to ch. xiii. 10, its full truth: thus it is neither, Ye *might*, and ought to have been already clean—nor is the ἤδη to be referred to the time of the Holy Ghost as brought forward into the present, for the word already spoken opposes this latter. But still less is this first καθαρός to be taken in the full meaning of the predicted καθαίρειν, as Stolz strangely interpreted—already *circumcised* and pure! But there is here indicated the important difference between the first, mighty *speaking clean* of justification which unites with Christ, and the continuous sanctification unto holiness. By this first election of grace (compare afterwards ver. 16), the wild plant is ingrafted into Christ and made into a branch; without this fruit could not be spoken of, much less the increase of fruit through purging. Those who are spoken clean at the beginning are clean; yet there follows on

[1] See on this transition of the ideas in διά, in Jno. vi. 56, 57.

that very account the deepening appropriation of this grace, which in continual mutual influence results from holiness unto holiness. Hiller: "That which is clean bears fruit; that which bears fruit becomes also clean." But this latter, the striving after holiness (ἁγνίζει ἑαυτόν, 1 Jno. iii. 3), which is awakened in the joy and new power of personal redemption, goes not forward, on account of our weakness and still-remaining impurity, without the help of the pruning-knife of discipline, which takes away every wild out-growth. Again, all the cultivation and care of disciplining grace is efficient only on the condition of our own receiving and faithfully keeping His word, our *abiding* on and in Christ. If the purging was before especially attributed to the Father, we now see that *Christ*, the living Vine, at once begins by His word to cleanse, and thus is *Himself the Vine-dresser;* for where the figure fails the plain words must complete the sense; thus exhibiting everywhere the essential unity of the Father and the Son. Chrys. and Augustine made use of this against the Arians, and we may add the *I have chosen and appointed*, ver. 16. All is originally from the Father, who plants and watches over His Son as a vine; but all is in equally essential truth from the same Son, who elects and makes fruitful His branches through His own word and Spirit.

Vers. 4, 5. This is indeed a wonderful Vine, which desires the *abiding* in Him; and they are wonderful branches which abide firm and grow ever more firmly together, even while they yet may separate themselves, else were they not living branches. Here the "on Me" has become "in Me," inasmuch as (for *thus far* the similitude reaches) the connection of the shoots with the stem is no mere joining on, but there is a participation of the same juice flowing from one into the other. With the κἀγὼ ἐν ὑμῖν there follows no second Imperative (as is self-evident), nor is it a mere promise, Then will I also abide in you! But they are connected conditionally, So act by your abiding *that* I, as I gladly would, may abide in you! The κἀγώ has indeed been taken for καθὼς ἐγώ, with a comparison of vers. 9, 10, ch. xvii. 21, 22—but that is something different, and, after the Lord has first given Himself to them, He now makes His abiding in them actually dependent on their abiding in Him. This, although contradicting a certain theology, is not

to be denied here, any more than in Scripture generally; we shall hear presently that those who abide not are to be thrown away! Ebrard develops the sacramental doctrine well from this sentence, and says, The two confessions appear to divide this verse, inasmuch as the one emphasizes the μείνατε on our side, and the other the κἀγώ on the Lord's. Assuredly, without our abiding in Him there is no abiding of the Lord in us; as without our receiving Him there is no such coming as ends in His indwelling. Yet it is not on the other hand to be forgotten, that He ever comes first and offers Himself, as we can abide in Him only while we—eat and drink. The truth which is here twice emphatically made prominent as the *interpretation* of the figure, that no one can do anything of himself, without and apart from Him, coincides in meaning with that utterance of ch. vi. 53, 56; and Roos thinks it "remarkable" that Christ does not repeat the saying about mutual *abiding* until He had instituted the ordinance for the eating and drinking His flesh and blood.

With great emphasis of only seeming tautology, He repeats the concentrated theme of the whole discourse here uttered:—I am the Vine, ye are the branches! By no means otherwise! Ye are nothing more than branches, and only such in Me! And thus, Whosoever abideth in Me (so that I can abide in him), *he* and no other—but certainly every such, not merely ye Apostles! *Much* fruit brings, finally, every living, abiding branch; for the overflowing sap of the vine pervades with so much vigour everything which is in Him. The following ὅτι significantly connects itself with the μένων, made prominent by the οὗτος. We might expect, *But* without Me *nothing!* That, however, would be something different, and a flat repetition of what has been already presupposed; therefore now the *for* refers the warning also to the already implanted and dependent branches:—even *ye* can do nothing if, and so far as, ye do not *abide!* How many there are who think they can do much without the Lord—but "the question here is not of external doing, and general influence upon men, but of the holy power to save ourselves and others, through deliverance from sin and death." (Schmieder.) Leaves and sour grapes are not fruit; there are grapes of the vine of Sodom, grapes of gall and clusters of bit-

terness. (Deut. xxxii. 32, 33.) Whosoever can do anything which avails before God, with a right mind, and action, and influence, can do it only through fellowship with Christ; for even the "sonship to God which leads to Christ" is only mediated by the already latent preparatory grace of Christ.[1] The grace which comes to us universally through Christ is absolutely necessary to account for even the "little righteousness of the merciful Samaritan," for which, however, Hollenbusch, in well-meaning error, holds "our natural virtue sufficient." But how much more absolutely true is it that for the full fruit-bearing of actual disciples, the same Christ alone affords the power! and yet how slow we are in fundamentally learning what is here declared and testified. "This word must evermore pursue us, so lightly do we forget it." (Berl. Bibel.) Χωρὶς ἐμοῦ is no mere *without*, which would say too little, and might be understood of the co-operation of our power and fidelity with His, of the mere *assistance* of grace; but it is "*apart from Me*," and corresponds with the ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ of the previous κλῆμα. Once more, this rigorous word of our Lord refers not simply to those who have entirely fallen away, as if He should say χωρισθέντες ἀπ' ἐμοῦ;[2] but in every instance in which those who hang upon Him allow themselves to be found "χωρὶς ἐμοῦ," their abiding thus being imperfect or partially ceasing, all their power and doing is so far reduced to a *nothing*. Finally, the ποιεῖν here, where figure and interpretation constantly interchange, is by no means the continuation of the figure, in which φέρειν and not ποιεῖν καρπόν is the word; but this *doing* goes beyond the figure, "falls into plain words" (de Wette), defends it at least from a too narrow interpretation, embraces together every *thinking anything as of ourselves* (2 Cor. iii. 5), with every result externally: apart from fellowship with Me ye can simply *accomplish* nothing, bring nothing to effect—that is, nothing good.

Ver. 6. At the close of the still figurative discourse it returns to the *taking away* of the unfruitful, ver. 2; but, as already said, in that verse those were especially referred to who have

[1] This, with reference to Lücke's unfounded remark against Calvin.

[2] This interpretation is jesuitically perverted by Maldonatus: Nos recte colligimus, Nisi in Christo manserimus, nihil possumus facere: *ergo* si in illo manserimus, *aliquid facere poterimus!*

been unfruitful from the beginning, while here the same doom is decreed against those who abide for a while, have brought forth a little fruit, but then, instead of being purged and suffering themselves to be *stript of self* in order to the increase of their fruit, are at last condemned as not abiding. As in the symbolical conclusion of the Sermon on the Mount, Matt. vii. 19,[1] so here, at the actual conclusion of all our Lord's preaching, the word of John the Baptist falls also upon the disciples themselves!—The plain, express language of our Lord remains in incontrovertible opposition to all predestinarian, unscriptural error concerning the indefectibility of a state of grace, and the impossibility that those who have been born again should ever perish—If a man *abide not in Me.* Let any one who has Lampe at hand mark how he struggles here. Alas, we have, in the Lutheran Richter's family Bible, the strange statement, "There is no example in Holy Scripture of any who actually *bare fruit* having perished." This most perilous assertion, which sets out with a much too limited notion of fruit-bearing, and may in many ways be refuted, needs not to be rebutted by any difficult disquisition upon the scriptural examples of final apostasy, even of the saints; the warning to the saints which pervades the *entire* Epistle to the Hebrews is enough, with such individual passages, of which there are many, as 2 John 8. If, according to Rev. iii. 11, even the crown may be taken away from those who hold not fast what they have, how can we so confidently assure ourselves against losing the little fruit of our state of grace?

Let us rather mark, with docile minds, how profoundly the Lord indicates one after the other "*the stages of apostasy and rejection.*"[2] First comes the solitary individual ground of it—If a man *abideth not* in Me; in connection with which there may be for a while the semblance or the delusion that he is a branch, for he is still in the Vine, in the vineyard. Then the *five* stages of judgment, the accomplishment of which begins in time, is fulfilled in eternity:—casting forth, withering, gathering, casting into the fire, burning. Between the first two there

[1] See Vol. i.

[2] With which title an excellent essay of Zeller is to be found in the Beugg. Monatsblatt. 1836. Nr. 11.

may *probably* be room for conversion and holiness, although we must not make our appeal to the re-ingrafting of the branches cut off through unbelief in the Epistle to the Romans; but when it comes to the bundles they seem to belong irrecoverably to the fire.

The Aorist in the first two stages must be carefully explained. Ἐβλήθη has been interpreted—Thus is he properly already cast away! Lutherans have so expounded it, without observing the liability of such a view to predestinarian perversion, without noting how little the corroborating ἔξω fits that sense, and still less the whole of the subsequent progression. Is indeed every man not abiding *eo ipso* already *withered;* does not this rather point plainly to a gradual process of spiritual death and destruction, into which he surrenders himself? In perfect contrast the Vulgate took these Aorists for Futures, and Glassius agrees with it; but this as little harmonises with an exact criticism. Grotius approached nearer the truth—the Aorist indicates *quod fieri solet.* But we must not omit to find in it the decisive assurance that such is the case, after the presupposed μὴ μείνῃ, as Bengel says: eo ipso dignus est, qui ejiciatur, atque ejicietur certo—in apodosi τὸ ἐβλήθη denotat id, *quod protinus evenit,* cf. Matt. xviii. 15. Just as Winer: "every not abiding has that for its instant result"—to which Lücke assents, and B.-Crusius, "All is as good as done, it assuredly so comes to pass." We also regard this as the only true interpretation, and the more confidently as with καὶ συνάγουσιν the discourse proceeds in perfect correspondence with it. We further hold with Bengel that ἔξω can only be e vineâ, so that thus the *breaking off* and *cutting away* from the vine-stock does not come first as a judgment, since it is the branch which has separated itself and *fallen away.*[1] Nevertheless, as Zeller rightly expounds, with this very first ἔξω the sundering from connection with the kingdom of God, from its holy influence and blessing, is consummated. The supply ceases, and it seems actually even here already as if (at least according to the similitude) no further

[1] Thus not with Winer: "he is like a branch *broken* off and thrown away, he belongs from that moment no more to the fruit-bearing vine." Nor altogether with Grotius: ἐκβάλλεσθαι ἔξω in comparatione est præcidi a vite.

growth upon the vine or taking root was to be thought of; for only that which is still in God's vineyard, albeit torn off and lying on the ground, could be partakers of that saving energy of the Spirit which in its wonderful efficiency transcends nature, or become, as it were, connected with one of the many roots of the great Vine which pervades the entire vineyard. Suffice it that the first stage of *rejection* is as decisive and complete as the *not abiding* was.

The second follows necessarily and naturally. If the sundered and rejected branch still retained a little sap and life from its former connection (a feature which altogether corresponds with the actuality of spiritual life)—even that must be soon lost, it perfectly *withers*. This certainly does not take place first in the day of judgment, as Grotius thinks—"its *uselessness becomes apparent*." This withering exhibits itself in its frightful reality before our eyes in the apostates, in whose case the delusion of independent power and virtue, and in the most fearful cases the imagination of a particular Christianity of their own, increases in the same degree as the last *life* from Jesus dies out. These are dry rejected branches, already given up by the heavenly Vine-dresser—and so must the earthly admit, after vain essays to re-establish their connection with the Vine. And if they are perfectly withered—*then*, but not before, because even judgment patiently leaves to all their time, they are *gathered together*. The sudden transition to the plural *αὐτά* would say—Think not that such a fearful case is a strange exception, it will befall many in time to come! Did the disciples now think of Judas? We think not; after chap. xiii. 29 follows their being undeceived as to the son of perdition in chap. xvii. 12,—and probably this last word itself was not understood by them all. But the Lord had assuredly the unhappy man before His eyes in this description, at least as long as He speaks in the singular number;[1] but now He looks through this prototype of apostates[2] to all that should follow

[1] Lampe would even explain the Aorist by reference to Judas—but this is too far-fetched.

[2] Judas was in any case once in Christ in a real sense, even if differently from others afterward, and almost passively so; otherwise he could not have been one lost among those given to Him, and not yet ripe for judgment.

down to the most distant futurity. Those who understand *συνάγειν* of mere gathering out, contradict the figurative description, the numbers which are suddenly introduced, and the very word itself. The parallel lies near—*συλλέγεται τὰ ζιζάνια*, Matt. xiii. 40; and according to this we should have here an abrupt transition to the judgment at the end of the world. Yet only a *transition;* for it gives us also an intimation how this collecting together of those destined to the fire is also *fore-prepared* in the judgments which befall the world and the outward kingdom:—to which, if we closely examine it, Matt. xiii. 30 by *ἐν καιρῷ* and *πρῶτον* points. Look, moreover, at the wicked unions and confederacies in the bonds of hell, into which, instead of fellowship with Christ and His saints, the withered branches fall, as the already prepared bundles of like sin and like doom! And they exist where our eyes do not see them, for there is everywhere a spiritual fellowship of the same natures. In *συνάγουσιν* and *βάλλουσι* we have not simply the active for the passive—they are collected and cast out; nor a meaningless—*they* collect them; but, as Matt. xiii. teaches us, it is an intimation of the work of the angels in the judgment. But the *fire* is assuredly, even on account of this most remarkable parallel, in which a synoptical *παραβολή* and a Johannæan *παροιμία* so closely touch one another, the oven of fire at the end of the days—with which the Griesbach-Schott reading *εἰς τὸ πῦρ*, received by Tischendorff, aptly agrees. Zeller transposes even this into the preparatory, commencing historical judgment of the world, as "the hellish kindling and fury of passions, the infernal fury of heated strife, fires of sedition, etc.," even so accommodating the interpretation of the *burning;* and in this there lies a true thought, but no correct exposition of the text, which evidently speaks of the end, and reaches and must reach into eternity, in order to reach its full conclusion. The *casting* into the fire as the fourth stage of judgment, is the still temporal crisis at the great day of judgment—but in *καίεται* as the *fifth* there follows the unending continuance of suffering in this fire. Of course this is the plural as following *αὐτά*;[1] and the return to the style of speaking which makes

[1] Not as in Nonnus: *ὁ δὲ φλογέῳ πυρὸς ἀτμῷ καίεται.*

the collected and rejected ones the subject again, in order to speak out their full doom, is itself significant. But the similitude here ends, it is sufficient no further. It is so far quite appropriate as withered *branches* are useless for anything but the fire (see Ezek. xv., and compare Matt. v. 13; Lu. xiv. 35) —but as the branches are consumed when burned, the aptness of the figure ceases. Those branches of which the Lord here speaks burn on for ever without being consumed. Luther well hits this in his translation of the awful *καίεται*—*and must burn*, which the corrected version gives—*and must.* Lampe, with a similar meaning, translated *et incendium fit*, and interprets—Concerning the damned the present may always be used; they burn, or they feed the fire.

For the rest, he who is not satisfied with this special development of the process of rejection, and would rather regard the figurative description as merely filling up the details of the similitude, must hold his own opinion; but let him not quarrel with us if we persist in thinking such a rhetorical painting out of the figure altogether inappropriate, and in regarding an exact impression of all the particulars of this wonderful parable as altogether in harmony with its close.

THE INTERPRETATION OF THE SIMILITUDE: THE LOVE OF THE LORD IN HIS DISCIPLES BRINGING FORTH ITS FRUIT.

(Ch. xv. 7–17.)

Ver. 7. An unfigurative discourse now follows, which only at the close (ver. 16) returns to the *fruit-bearing*, in order to show that it is no other than a continuous interpretation. After the judgment upon those not abiding has been so fearfully announced, the Lord swiftly turns to consolatory and gracious promise for those who abide. As if He would say—Only those who wilfully forsake Me shall ever thus burn; only apart from Me ye can do nothing and fall to ruin, In Me ye can do all things! Thus now we have the true, attractive, and hortatory explanation of the *main point* which decides—*μένειν ἐν ἐμοί.*[1]

[1] Which expression, according to Besser's (somewhat uncertain) reckoning, occurs ten times.

The *first* abiding, which corresponds with the first cleansing, ver. 3, consists in this, that we abide in His word (ch. viii. 31), and allow the good word of God which has been tasted (Heb. vi. 5) to remain and work its full effect in us. Thus, consequently, *His words* properly abide in us (ch. viii. 37), and these words promise all which is lacking to us, they teach us *prayer* as the way to an ever more perfect *doing*. (Ch. xiv. 13.)[1] The reading *αἰτήσασθε*, restored by Lachmann, appears quite genuine, for it yet more strongly encourages; and the immediate *καὶ γενήσεται* seems more suitable to that than *δοθήσεται*. Ask only, and it shall be, it shall be done unto you! If His words remain in us, His prayer pre-eminently remains in us, as He has taught it and sealed it with His Amen:—such prayer is the fruit of His Spirit in us, and produces ever new and increasing fruit. Its being heard is secure, for we then ask nothing unconditionally personal and external, but everything only with reference to His kingdom, to His and His Father's glory. *What ye will*—but what we will as His disciples, it follows immediately in the next verse—the bringing forth much fruit.

Ver. 8. *Ἐν τούτῳ* does not refer to the previous abiding and asking, as many think, but it is to be construed with *ἵνα*:—by your fruit-bearing will be or is My Father honoured. Comp. here ver. 13, then ch. xvi. 7, xvii. 3, vi. 29, iv. 34; 1 Jno. iv. 17, and what we have remarked concerning this *ἵνα* instead of *ὅτι* upon ch. iv. 34.[2] By this much fruit must not be understood, we repeat, exclusively or even especially the results of

[1] Roos has a subtle remark: "It would not have befitted Him to say—If I abide in you, because that would have seemed to hint that He might fail them. Therefore He said—If My words abide in you, My words, that is, concerning which it was plain that they might or might not keep them. (Ch. xiv. 23, 24.) To keep the Lord Jesus Himself is not a becoming expression."

[2] Thus not with Wahl: On account of this or to this end (*εἰς τοῦτο*) has the Father revealed Himself to you in His glory, *in order that, etc.* Lücke rightly protests against this explanation of *ἐδοξάσθη* as the revelation of the Father through the Son. Fikenscher repeats it, however, and unaptly transposes the thought: "That was the *aim* of His glorification, to make you fruitful in good works!" By no means, God's honour can never be the means to any still further end; but our fruit-bearing honours the Father.

their mission, their influence upon others; this is included, but *here* the growth and progress to perfection of the disciples themselves is first of all intended. Nonnus: πίστιος ἔμφρονα καρπόν. For the Lord does not go on to say—that ye may become many, that ye may make many disciples; but—*so shall ye be My disciples*, of which more anon. First we must remark that the Aorist again, ἐδοξάσθη, retains its critical meaning, not being merely instead of the Present, but—Therein *is* at once and ever My Father glorified. (See Winer S. 228.) That the sanctification of the children of God conduces to the honour of *their* Father (for which, however, is here designedly substitued *My Father*), inasmuch as it shines outwardly in their walk, we have found already in Matt. v. 16—and even without this, if we can suppose it wanting, the Father has His honour in the fruit of His grace and culture. Luther: "This means not only that our works appear in the world honourable as good fruit, but that they are carried up to heaven and offered to God, so that He accepts them as His especial honour and highest service." And so those may take courage whose *light* the people will not regard, whose good fruits men turn to scorn!

In the second clause some (Lücke and Lachmann) read γένησθε on account of the ἵνα, or (like the Vulg. efficiamini) at any rate construe the clause in that way, some examples of ἵνα with the future Indicative being found in St John, see Winer S. 238. But we assent to Kling, that the καὶ γενήσεσθε is not parallel with καρπὸν φέρητε, but with ἐδοξάσθη ὁ πατήρ. That is, "the ἐμοί, whether taken as a dat. or as a plur. possess. pron.,[1] appears to indicate a co-ordination with ὁ πατήρ—Therein, that ye bring forth much fruit, is My *Father* glorified, and I shall have in you genuine disciples, who will do Me honour." Bengel's interpretation was just the same; and this alone satisfies our feeling concerning an utterance which would otherwise be wanting in that distinctive complementary reference to the person of Christ in juxtaposition with the Father which is found everywhere else in this discourse. The assertion that they would be disciples (if the ἐμοί did not introduce a new emphasis), as a mere exposition or as the result of the bearing much fruit, would

[1] We prefer the Dative, as in ch. xii. 35.

be a feeble supplement. But now this *becoming*, as co-ordinate and synonymous with the growing to yet richer fruit, has a deep emphasis: the Lord places the truth of this high name *μαθηταί* still higher than before in ch. viii. 31. Bengel: fastigium, *esse* discipulum Christi! This consummation of the *discipleship*, as the Father's and the Son's *honour*, so also their own, even for the *Apostles* exhibits a higher aim than their apostolical dignity; it is the *τελεία μαθητεία*, which, according to the apt expression of Euthymius (who puts *ἀπαρτισθήσεσθε* for *γενήσεσθε*), alone can fully glorify and rejoice the Father of Christ.

Vers. 9, 10. But the *common life*, which from the vine-stock pervades the branches, and produces their precious clusters (as their ever new sprouts also); the essential Divine element, so to speak, by means of which this *διδάσκαλος* (ch. xiii. 13), unlike any other, has *μαθητάς* as branches growing upon and from Him, through Him alone bearing fruit—this juice of the Vine, this blood of the Body, this more than mere binding cement of the living Temple (for this last figure is not here sufficient), is *love*. (Eph. iii. 17–19, iv. 16.) Love is the first root-principle in God, the first living germ in us; and perfect love, as God loves, is also the last ripe fruit. Our growth proceeds from love to love, and may therefore be graciously called merely *an abiding in love*, inasmuch as the implanted first love bears in itself already all its consummation, and is the pledge of it under the condition of this *abiding*. But now the love, with which the Lord first loveth His own *in order that* they may also be able to love Him in return and in Him one another also, has its origin and deepest principle in the *love of the Father* (ch. x. 15). We can think of nothing beyond this, nothing greater is to be promised than that the love, in which the Father and the Son through the Spirit are eternally one, should be poured out also in us. (Ch. xvii. 26.) That is not merely the first love of compassion for all the world, which indeed cannot be like the love of the Father to the Son, but that which we shall find in ch. xvi. 27. Hence we must not with Luther begin an altogether new clause with *μείνατε*, but ver. 9 is one connected whole; the *κἀγώ* belongs still to the premiss, as Maldon. and Grot. construe it, and as the obvious comparison with vers. 4, 5, indicates. His love to us is indeed only the further extension and overflowing of the

Father's love *to* and *in* Him, and in *this* love we are to continue.[1] And this of itself shows the sole true sense of the ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ τῇ ἐμῇ, concerning which expositors foolishly contend whether it means love to Me or from Me. When Nösselt, Kuinoel, and others understand our love to Jesus, they overlook that the μένειν involves a continuation of the ἠγάπησα ὑμᾶς. When, again, most others (after Cyril, Apollin., Chrys., Augustin, Calvin) regard it as expressing only Christ's love to us, they approach nearer a right understanding, but they are still entangled in an incorrect apprehension of its fulness of meaning.[2] Love, both in ver. 9 and ver. 10, is not to be viewed otherwise than as St John and St Paul elsewhere speak of the ἀγάπη τοῦ θεοῦ in us with similar fulness of meaning; so that all love (like all righteousness, according to the formula δικαιοσύνη τοῦ θεοῦ which must be interpreted in like manner) is livingly imputed, communicated, and implanted in us at once, from the Father through Christ.[3] As, according to vers. 4, 5, our abiding in Him is only the condition of our retaining His abiding in us, not otherwise is it here. Lampe rightly decided upon the question whether it is His love to us, or our love to Him, by his *utrumque jungendum;* but we would further add that our love *one to another* is actually included also as a necessary consequence. Far back in the apocryphal, but so far genuine, development of the Old Testament doctrine, Wisd. vi. 17–20, all things down to the ἀφθαρσία and the ἐγγὺς εἶναι θεοῦ is derived from ἀγάπη as its original, yea even the τήρησις νόμων; but there is now something more than an ἐγγὺς εἶναι revealed to us—a real living and loving of God in us, because the Son abideth in us and we in

[1] Ἐγὼ ἠγάπησα assuredly refers to the life of the Son in the world, from the time when His love could flow towards and influence them; but the ἠγάπησέ με is not similarly to be limited to this earthly life of Jesus (with von Gerlach), but it reaches back into eternity. Christ has brought down, has brought with Him the love of God from the bosom of the Father.

[2] Klee would find the double sense of the expression, first in ver. 10, in ἀγάπῃ μου; we cannot see why, since τῇ ἐμῇ, rather, more strongly indicates beforehand that all the love of which He speaks, down to vers. 12 and 17, is His own, proceeding solely from Him.

[3] Thus not as Fikenscher thinks, that Jesus, ver. 9, exhorts to an abiding love *towards* Himself, and then first in ver. 10 (a very incorrect inversion!) assures us of His abiding love towards us.

the Son, as the Father in the Son and the Son in the Father. But as there, so here, ver. 10 is supplementarily added for defence against all self-deception concerning this indwelling life, giving us the test of *keeping the commandments;* and this must be understood precisely as in ch. xiv. 15. The Lord *has loved* His own unto the end, which is here ever thought of as already come; even so He hath kept down to His departure the Father's commandment and commission, in His state of humiliation He hath preserved His obedience in analogy with ourselves, *and* so He abideth in His Father's love.[1] Mark the transition into the Present *μένω*, which at once embraces His glorification; and the *αὐτοῦ* which expressly comes first, according to which even in Christ the eternal love of the Father appears as the sole, abiding, impulsive principle of all His life and suffering, of all His acts and of all His love.

Ver. 11. *Ταῦτα λελάληκα* is again an anticipation, hastening on to His departure, as if He would close and had already closed. *My joy in you* is as wide and deep in its meaning as the *love;* but now the two critical points for our understanding the sense are designedly separated. First comes the explanatory *ἐμὴ ἐν ὑμῖν* (the centre of the whole discourse) which gives us the true solution; and then is mentioned the *χαρὰ ὑμῶν* which flows from the former. Most expositors have, from the earliest times, overshot the true sense through a misapplied logical division, which cannot or will not enter into the mystery of the new language concerning the union between Christ and us. That *ἡ χαρὰ ἡ ἐμὴ* cannot be—your joy *in Me*, concerning Me and My departure,[2] is plain in the very words, for this pronoun could scarcely be so used; and, moreover, ch. xiv. 28 taught us that He also still found *this* joy wanting in the disciples. Most have applied themselves to defend the translation of *ἐν ὑμῖν* (though quite in opposition to the fundmental notion of *ἐν* throughout this discourse) thus—My *joy in or over you.* Augustin: Quid est gaudium Christi in nobis, nisi quod dignatur gaudere de nobis? So also, *e.g.*, Gerhard, Cocceius, Lampe, Heumann, Zeltner (in the Altorf Bible), the Hirschberg Bible, Kuinoel, Hess ("I say this unto you, in order that I may be

[1] Nonnus: *ἀπονεύμενος* (abiens) *εἰσέτι μίμνω.*

[2] As Theophyl., Euthym., Nonn., Grot., Nösselt, etc., thought.

able to continue My joy over you"); and Lücke earlier, "the joy of Christ over His disciples, if they should continue in love to Him." But Kling protests against this, and compares the εἰρήνη of ch. xiv. 27. And Lücke afterwards rightly explains, admitting this: "the joy of Christ is His own sacred bliss, the joy of the holy Son in the consciousness of the love of God, of His unity with the Father; comp. ver. 10." This is more correct than v. Gerlach's only approximate, and mediating view, according to which we must first hold fast that "the joy of Christ is the happiness which He experienced *in looking upon His new creation*, His believing, loving, fruit-bearing disciples"—thus still making ἐν ὑμῖν, over you—and then after He assures them of His divine joy, His gracious good-pleasure *in them*, it passes over to themselves, and "His joy becomes the incessantly streaming source of their joy." O no, that is (if we may so speak) much too Pauline a derivation of their joy from an assuring justification utterance—I have My joy in you! for in the mind of Christ, according to St John, the ἐμὴ ἐν ὑμῖν indicates the living interchange of fellowship.

We must not, once more, with Cyril, Erasmus, Meyer, and others, limit the thought to the *kind* of joy which Christ had, that is, in heavenly things, in the love of the Father, with a tacit opposition to false, earthly joy; as if He meant—that ye may learn to find your joy where I do! This is far from the sense here, and only spoils the thought, as deep as it is simple. *Christ* has in Himself and retains *joy*, not merely peace: this He testifies here on the way to His passion, for that is no other than His glorification! He rejoices in His departure (Bengel and Semler lay the emphasis upon this), but He also rejoices generally and always as abiding in the love of the Father, and further He already rejoices, doubtless, over His disciples—but this last does not lie in the ἐν ὑμῖν, if there at all it comes in after the rest. All *His* joy and "*joyousness*"[1] would from this time (that is, when the truth and reality of His proleptic words should be made present by His Spirit) pass over into His disciples, and make its abode in them. Thus "*My joy*" is pre-eminently the joy which He Himself has, but then immediately "*might remain*

[1] As B.-Crusius well says, referring to the antithesis with *troubled*, ch. xiv. i. 27. Compare also *peace and joy*, Rom. xiv. 17.

in you" makes it the joy which He gives, of which He is the foundation and source, as Calvin views it: comp. ch. xvii. 13, and 1 Jno. i. 4, for the πληροῦσθαι. Consequently, and to obviate once more a too external meaning, "*your joy*" is by no means only their joy "in Him and His work" (as Lücke first said), but the gladness in God which flowed from Him into them. The joy of Jesus of course required no πληροῦσθαι, for He had it from the beginning, brought with Him from eternity;[1] our joy is made perfect *out of His*, the more fully we grow together with Him and bring forth fruit. B.-Crusius, who at first had a presentiment of the right meaning, most rationalistically perverts it when he says, "*Your joy* may be that gladness which they might have had *already in themselves;* thus—That your own joy may increase more and more, and My higher joy be *added* unto it!" Here there is no *being added*, but all is entirely in and from Him. Finally, it is not a contradiction, but strictly conformable to the spirit of the whole discourse, which recognises both abiding and increasing in this abiding, that concerning the same joy μένειν is first used, and then πληροῦσθαι is added. Lachmann's reading ᾖ for μείνῃ[2] is quite groundlessly defended by Lücke and Luthardt; by Lücke, because the gladness in the disciples could be regarded as arising only after the abatement of their sorrow: but he overlooks, what is obvious throughout the chapter, that the ground of their fellowship with Jesus is actually already established, and we would rather say with B.-Crusius that the previous words concerning *continuance* are here carried on.[3]

Vers. 12, 13. Alluding to ch. xiii. 34, the Lord adds in repetition the new thought touching the greatness of that love which lays life down for others, thus paving the way for the great word that He now called His own His *friends*. Αὕτη ἐστίν makes markedly prominent this *one thing*, in which all specific *com-*

[1] Even Augustine, who, as before quoted, understands His gaudium de nobis as gratia, quam præstitit nobis, says also: Nec possumus dicere, quod gaudium ejus plenum non erat, non enim Deus imperfecte aliquando gaudebat. See the entire passage in Klee.

[2] In the Vulg. and Syr. expressly used (תֶּהֱוֵא—sit); recognised in the Gnomon by Bengel, but afterwards retracted.

[3] The ᾖ might have only arisen, either from an error of transcription [μὲν] ᾖ, as Mill—or, as Bengel and Schott thought, from the similarity of sound in ὑμῖν.

mandments, ver. 10, are wrapped up; *here* the ἵνα is obviously the explanatory ὅτι—for the comparison with ταῦτα λελάληκα ἵνα, ver. 11 (depending on which αὕτη *might*, indeed, be made to refer to all that preceded, and ἵνα taken in its natural meaning,—but this would be too artificial), is outweighed by the other parallel, ver. 8, ἐν τούτῳ ἵνα, as well as by the obvious allusion to the *commandment* given in ch. xiii. Moreover, in ver. 13, we have a similar ταύτης ἵνα again. But the declaration, asserted with a rigorous οὐδείς, that there is no *greater* love than to lay down life for *friends*, has in its reference to our Lord Himself something strange, as every one must feel. We cannot say that He spoke *merely* of what *we* may do among ourselves, because in ver. 14 there immediately follows an application to Himself and His disciples. It is manifest that our Lord graciously condescends so deeply to a comparison with our human relations, that He, as it were, leaves out of sight for a time the all-embracing, and in the solitary sense atoning, character of His death: comp. what we remarked upon Matt. xx. 28. Richter makes the same observation: Here the Lord does not speak (primarily) of the redeeming design of His death, as in Rom. v. 8, etc.,[1] but of that point of similarity in great love, which we may recognise and imitate. Satan, in Job ii. 4, describes rightly the selfish natural man, to whom to preserve his life and save his skin is the supreme object, but there have been on the other hand, through the prevenient grace of Christ, examples even among the heathen of the sacrifice of life for friends:—comp. Rom. v. 7, where the same is still more closely restricted to a thankful love toward benefactors. Even the future love of the disciples of Christ would not overpass this measure of love, than which there is none greater: more than this therefore will not be required, 1 Jno. iii. 16. Only that in these commenting parallels it is made more clear than here, that the disciples of *Christ* regard in Him and after His example those whom the world would call their enemies, as their friends and brethren, even as they love their souls. And in this we have the reconciling explanation of the word that our Lord lays down His life only for His *friends*—in apparent contradiction to that affecting and profound passage, Rom. v. 8–10. We must not,

[1] Nonnus therefore speaks improperly of λύτρον ἑῶν ἑτάρων!

therefore, say with von Gerlach, "This entire discourse of Jesus lingers in His simple relation to His friends; hence the meaning —*Toward his friends* man can show no greater love." For the inversion which throws the *ὑπὲρ τῶν φίλων* by anticipation into the unconditional *οὐδεὶς ἔχει* which comes first, is altogether unjustified; and we have seen from the *πᾶν κλῆμα*, ver. 2 downward, with what far-reaching glance the Lord regards these disciples as representatives of all future disciples. This much is true, that on the one hand the Lord did actually die—quoad effectum—only for His friends or His sheep, the children of God scattered abroad, see ch. x. 12, 15, 16, xi. 52. But, on the other hand, the qualification of this must be sought in bringing forward from the background of this word, which so condescendingly draws this comparison with the greatest exhibition of our poor human love, the thought, which is more than merely an edifying appendage, that—Jesus calls even sinners and enemies, whom He desires to save, His friends, inasmuch as and because He is first their friend (Lu. vii. 34). This vindication of His deeper meaning actually follows afterward in vers. 15, 16—I have first called you and made you friends, I have chosen and ordained you. Hence Lücke, like Luther, has no hesitation in putting these passages together. Luther: "Ye were before enemies, but ye are now friends, because I hold you as friends, not that ye have done any good to Me, according to the world's notion of friends—to them I do good in vain. I die for such friends as have never done Me any good; only I have loved them and made them friends." Lücke: "The love wherewith, according to St Paul, He dieth for sinners, is at the same time the love whereby, according to St John, He maketh the disciples His friends. He dies for sinners, only because in the fulness of His love He regards them as friends."

Ver. 14. The disciples assuredly referred that "greatest love, the laying down life for friends," although the Lord spoke touching their *ἀγαπᾶν ἀλλήλους*, first of all and pre-eminently to His own *ἠγάπησα ὑμᾶς*. Then are *we* His friends? We miserable men, whose weakness and folly have wrought Him already so much distress? We sinners the *friends* of the Holy One, the Son of God? That was the thought which immediately sprang up in their minds, and the Lord impressively con-

firms it—*Ye are!* But with two modifications He confirms it. First, there is the less warning than encouraging *note for the future*, which unites friendship with obedience towards their *commanding* Friend—Ye are (and shall be) such, if ye do what I command you.[1] Then, in order to avert a legal misunderstanding of this ἐντέλλομαι, comes the distinctive declaration of vers. 15, 16—Through My word, in My voluntary love, I make you and call you My friends! Lampe's comment is quite correct: "They are wrong who follow Salmeron in deducing from this passage that *the Gospel is not a bare promise of grace, but hedged in by a condition.* There is no condition of friendship with Jesus here proposed. He prescribes *precepts* for the future; but He already declared them to be friends, and He had before regarded them so, as the following clause shows."

Ver. 15. Glassius finds it easy to assert that οὐκέτι stands merely for οὐκ, but exegesis will not tolerate this any longer. The reason which he adduces has in it some ground of truth,—"Christ had never called the disciples *servants* in that sense in which the name is opposed to friends, and denotes a state of servile fear and despotic restraint; but He had always conversed with them, in the most friendly manner, as His friends." The οὐκέτι, on the other hand, maintains its strict propriety, inasmuch as the only passage in which He had ever called them friends, and which is always quoted, Lu. xii. 4 (with which John xi. 11 is to be combined), is far from having the meaning which the word has here, as a developed contrast with "servant." In the Synoptical parables they are always servants, and Lu. xvii. 7–10 is strong enough, indeed, for this rigorous idea. In John xiii. 13, 16, the same was said of which they are here (ch. xv. 20) again reminded, for a testimony that the servant-relation was not to be abolished but to be glorified; but the distinction holds good, that only from this time, when the Spirit should bring to their minds the truth of these *last* sayings, should the full freedom and joy of the *love* of their Lord rise up in their souls. The proof of the relation of friendship is that open, confidential, unrestrained communion, the typical expressions of

[1] The ὅσα is probably a well-intentioned but incorrect strengthening of the proper reading ἃ, for "that which He now imposes upon them to keep (commits, entrusts), is no other than *love*, ver. 17."

which are found in the Old Testament—in Abraham's case, Gen. xviii. 17 (hence Jas. ii. 23; Isa. xli. 8; 2 Chron. xx. 7) —that of Moses, Ex. xxxiii. 11—of the pious generally, Ps. xxv. 14; Prov. iii. 32; Amos iii. 7; Job xxix. 4. But how far above that סוֹד יְהוָה is this declaration, that the Son makes known to His own all that He hath heard of the Father, utters and commits to their fidelity the entire, full truth of the last revelation! A qualification of this *πάντα* may be thought to be found in ch. xvi. 12—but these different sayings are perfectly accordant, since the Lord had actually made known unto them all that He had heard and received of the Father for them, and this so entirely embraced the whole truth that the subsequent revelation of the Spirit should be only an explanation and development of the Words of the Son.[1]

Ver. 16. Finally, as said above, though the Lord calls us friends, this does not by any means imply such an equality and reciprocation as exist between human friends. He calls His followers afterwards even *brethren*, but they all the more reverently call Him only their Lord and their God.[2] That which the Lord, preserving His majesty in His condescension, and asserting His own prerogative as the Vine, goes on to say, is only the New Testament expression of what we find already in Isa. xliii. 21–25, the immovable, plainly announced but unfathomable mystery of election. Not according to Augustin's views of prescience and predestination, but as Rom. viii. 29, rightly expounded, speaks of it. (See on this passage, Klee's note, S. 407.) The truth of the saying which we have now before us remains—The love between us began with Me and not with you! (1 Jno. iv. 10.) Not ye have chosen Me:—

[1] B.-Crusius is altogether incorrect in his conclusion, that "they now know even *as* the Son knew—for not merely the object of their knowledge, but the method of it, is here referred to." By no means; for no man but the Son hath *heard immediately of the Father*, comp. ch. vi. 46.

[2] Only in the Old-Testament tone of the typical Canticles, is it permitted to us to speak of our "Friend." Else, in the spirit of the New Testament it is unscriptural, though our modern sentimental hymns and prayers may make thus bold. In the author's hymn, "Herr Jesu Christe, Gottes Sohn" (Krummacher's Zionsharfe N. 168. Rauschenbusch Missions-Gesangbuch, N. 174), the line "Du Freund voll Milde und Gedabuld" is an unjustifiable insertion by another hand.

there may be in this (as Whitby says) an *allusion* to the custom of disciples choosing their own Rabbis in Israel, whereas the Lord had spontaneously called His disciples; but the meaning reaches much beyond this, as the relation is much more profound. The discourse here is of choosing and ordaining for fruit, consequently of an ἐκλέγεσθαι which can have no application to Judas, though he also was chosen in another sense.

How is ἔθηκα to be understood? It is generally, and without qualification, taken according to the apostolical usage, as in Acts xiii. 47, xx. 28; 1 Thess. v. 9; 1 Tim. i. 12; 1 Pet. ii. 8. We do not deny that the meaning of the expression tends to that, inasmuch as it appears to be parallel with ἐξελέξαμην, as its consequence and development; but we would not altogether reject the ancient comment of Chrys., Euthym., and Theoph., who explain this ἔθηκα by ἐφύτευσα. (Comp. שׂוּם, Isa. xxviii. 25; Heb., Ezek. xvii. 4, and in Sept. ἔθετο.) For it is evident that the Lord returns, in the clause following, to the figure; and inasmuch as ἔθηκα in this transition is connected with ἵνα καρπον φέρητε, this interpretation is not unwarranted, and does not by any means carry the figure beyond its prescribed limits. And this gives a good reason for the remark of Theophylact (hinted at in ver. 3), that the Son here again, like the Father, appears as a γεωργός and Planter of vines. The *branches* become elevated, as it were, themselves into new *vines* of the second degree, since the Lord sets them to bear fruit. For (as Fikenscher well says, on this occasion) "He who is *united with* Christ, obtains thereby the true *independence*, and stands before God as a personality pervaded by Christ." In the same middle-tone between parable and interpretation we understand (though without contending for it) the appended ὑπάγειν. It is assuredly incorrect—since that would be indeed (Olshausen) to mix the unfigurative and figurative together—to interpret this ὑπάγειν, with Grotius and Lampe, of the going forth of the Apostles on their missionary labours:—excitantur apostoli, ut non exspectent, dum homines discendi avidi ad se veniant, *sed ipsi ultro eos quærant!*[1] This needs no refutation. Conse-

[1] Similarly, Luther too: "that ye sit not still without work and fruit, but show yourselves publicly, that other people may have the good of you." Lange, again: "They were to go forth into the world, like Himself!"

quently, we must connect this *ὑπάγειν* closely with *καρπὸν φέρειν*, taking it figuratively in allusion to the increasing, spreading branches; for which we have the support of the well-known Hebraism of הלך and יסף for increasing in anything, going on to "more and more." See Ex. xix. 19 (Sept. *προβαίνουσαι*)—2 Sam. iii. 1; Jon. i. 11 (Sept. *ἐπορεύετο*)—Prov. iv. 18 (Sept. *προπορεύονται*)—to which some have also referred the *πορευόμενοι συμπνίγονται* of Lu. viii. 14, in their seeming growth they are choked, etc.[1] Hence Chrys., Euthym., Theoph., *ἵνα ἐκτείνησθε αὐξανόμενοι*; and in Seiler's N. T. we have it plainly translated—"that ye may increase, and bring forth more and more fruit." On the other hand, this is an unusual meaning of *ὑπάγειν*, which certainly seems to allude more or less to the actual life and energy of individual persons; and we, therefore, with Luther, Baum.-Crusius, de Wette, Lücke, Luthardt, vibrating between figure and reality, would say that it is simply an expression of living energy—as a man goes forth to work in a not idle course, as a plant through the vigour of its internal life increases and spreads.

It is abundantly plain that the *fruit* is not to be understood of external results, of winning and converting others specifically, for it was to remain to the fruit-bearers themselves (*καρπὸς ὑμῶν*), as their own most precious possession and gain. Bengel: vobis seritur, vobis metitur—to be explained by Rom. vi. 22. The fruit is not the ever-abiding church which the Apostles have founded (see Apollinarius in Lampe), for this reason, that the Lord addresses in these Apostles His future disciples also, and such as have no missionary vocation; but it is the consummation of personal salvation, their ripening into men of God, full, indeed, of good works and all holy activity, each in his own sphere. And even when the inscription over Zinzendorf—"He was ordained that he should bring forth fruit, and fruit that should remain"—does not, as in his case, demonstrate itself before the eyes of the world, the fruit of every living branch will abide, nevertheless, as its own in the form of those works of righteousness which follow the believer. (Rev. xiv. 13.)

The second *ἵνα* cannot possibly be subordinate to the first, as

[1] Different from our exposition of the passage—they go forth with utter indecision.

Lücke at first thought, taking it ἐκβατικῶς for ὥστε, and thus regarding "the whole clause as a close definition of the gradation of apostolical work and influence." We cannot realise the precise meaning of the idea, that they were to bring forth so much fruit, or in such a manner, that they might as the result thereof more effectually pray. For their prayer would itself be fruit, while it is also in vers. 7, 8 the way to secure that fruit. Olshausen is right in denying that *prayer* could be regarded as the final *end* of the Divine calling and planting; but his own explanation that "they should bring forth fruit, *abiding* fruit, *so that they might enter into that internal relation to God* from which prayer in the name of the Lord proceeds," is highly obscure and artificial. Would not this, apart from the forced change of the concrete ὅ, τι ἂν αἰτησήτε, etc., into the principle of a general relation, be a ὕστερον πρότερον still,—first the fruit, and that increasing and permanent to eternity, and then as a *consequence* the power and the right to ask of the Father? Consequently, we must, with Lücke's later view, decide that the ἵνα in both cases is parallel and co-ordinate,—"because the fruit-bearing of the disciples is no other than the proof and attestation of the power of their prayer in the name of Jesus."[1] And still more clearly—because it cannot be produced save in this way, through continuance in ever-receiving prayer. Thus the prayer is by no means the *final* end of the planting, that must be the mature fruit, but it is added with retrospective reference, in order to show how it should proceed in the whole ὑπάγειν from the first ἔθηκα ὑμᾶς:—I have planted and appointed you that ye should bring forth fruit, *that is*, that ye should secure fruit by your effectual prayer.

Ver. 17. This verse is sometimes improperly regarded as the

[1] We cannot understand how Münchmeyer can consider this as "very forced;" to us it appears conformable both to the language (even without the καί of co-ordination) and to the matter. Luthardt thinks it grammatically harsh, but how is it so? Alford, who is generally disposed to be philologically keen enough, takes no objection to this, but says, "This ἵνα is parallel with the former, not the result of it; the two, the bringing forth of fruit and the obtaining answer to prayer, being co-ordinate with each other; but (vers. 7, 8) the bearing fruit to God's glory is of these the greater, being the result and aim of the other." This gives occasion to this unwonted, but not inadmissible form of speech.

commencement of another section, but it is the summing up and conclusion of what has gone before. *Ταῦτα* is taken by Tholuck and B.-Crusius for *τοῦτο*, and there are examples which may be adduced; but for the simple statement of the one commandment (*αὕτη*, ver. 12), such a plural seems to us quite inappropriate.[1] We are convinced that *ταῦτα*, as always in St John (or almost always), refers back to what has preceded, embracing not only what had immediately, but also what had more distantly, preceded—once more as in ver. 11.[2] The Vulg. has, Hæc mando vobis ut.—We understand the Lord to say—By all these My discourses and commandments I would specially point you to that One which I would confirm in your hearts, *that ye love one another!* Thus does He ever return to that *ἐντολὴ καινή*, though here it is no mere repetition—This I command you! once more. The disciples are to love *one another—not* then the world without? We have already given our answer at length on chap. xiii. Should they hate, or scorn, the world? Far be it, this is never found in all our Lord's sayings. But in spite of all their love the world will hate *them*, and the Lord's meaning in *ἀλλήλους* seems to contain a *transition* to the needful remarks which He would now make upon that subject. As Ammonius has observed: *ὡς μελλόντων μισεῖσθαι παρὰ πάντων, παραγγέλλει αὐτοῖς ἀγαπᾷν ἀλλήλους*—though it does not necessarily follow from this view that *ταῦτα ἵνα* is to be taken for *τοῦτο ὅτι*.

[1] Fikenscher helps himself little by saying—"The Lord had previously, vers. 10 and 12, exhibited the commandment of love as *several* and *single;* moreover, love is regarded as contained in its manifestation, good works." Let him whom this pleases, be satisfied with it!

[2] Münchmeyer thinks this *quite erroneous*, because in that case we must have had the Perfect as in ver. 11—a very weak reason! And because *ἐντέλλεσθαι* is not *λαλεῖν*—which is equally inconclusive, for in these discourses the Lord has used *ἐντολαί μου*, *λόγος*, *ῥήματα*, as we have seen, interchangeably,—comp. Matt. xxviii. 20. Finally he contends that with *ἐντέλλομαι* and *ἐντολή* the substance of the command is introduced always by *ἵνα*. Now *ἐντέλλεσθαι* is not elsewhere found with *ἵνα*; *ἐντολή* is thrice, chap. xi. 57, xiii. 34, xv. 12; but this gives no absolute law of usage. Luthardt unhesitatingly agrees, that ver. 17 *looking back* and *embracing* all that had been said, forms a transition to a new subject.

THE HATRED OF THE WORLD TO THE DISCIPLES OF THEIR LORD: THE INEXCUSABLE SIN OF UNBELIEF.

(Chap. xv. 18–25.)

Ver. 18. When in our general analysis of the whole we said that the ἀγαπᾶτε ἀλλήλους awakened anew the thought of the world's hatred, we spoke only in the ordinary style of such analysis. Not as if the Lord did actually come to speak, through the suggestion of the word concerning brotherly love, of that world which would not suffer itself to be drawn within the circle of love. He had already in chap. xiv. strongly laid down the contrast and the distinction between His disciples and the world; from beginning to end (see chap. xvii.), it was indispensable that He should give to His own, for their subsequent encouragement, plain pre-intimations of the world's hatred and persecution. Since ver. 14 it seems probable that the *enemies* were in His thought who would be distinguished from these *friends;* hence one might in ver. 17 hear such an undertone as this, preparing for the subsequent sentence—Yea, there is need that ye should be all the more closely united in My love, *for* the world hateth you! We doubt much whether we can accept the meaning which Richter inlays into the words—"Against this great hatred ye must find your great *compensation* in love, the blessedness of which maketh the bitter sweet;" since this developed thought rather *presupposes* than leads to the words concerning the hatred of the world.[1]

A loving heart would fain find or create love everywhere: to be ungratified in that desire, and more than that to be *hated*, is a hard and bitter lot, the bitterest ingredient in all affliction. Therefore the Lord discreetly and faithfully prepares them for this, that they may not marvel at this destiny or count it a strange thing, as the Evangelist in his Epistle (1 John iii. 13) has expanded the theme. They must for their own part love and preserve peace, do nothing, which they may omit without sin, to provoke or warrant the hatred of the world: therefore

[1] Still less "that it may sound the alarm for strife." (Rieger.)

He speaks deliberately with an *If* concerning this lamentable and unavoidable circumstance. In His further explanation it appears plain that to be hated of the world will be a necessary consequence and an inseparable mark of His true discipleship; nevertheless He speaks *here* not so much for the condemnation and warning of those gentle ones who do not disoblige the world, as for the pure encouragement of oppressed and discomfited souls. The most conscientious and tender Christian is the most likely to fall into the temptation of seeking the cause of the world's hatred solely in himself, of thinking that if he were perfect in goodness, love, humility, and meekness, the evil of the world must needs be overcome. And this again might lead to a false compliance, and a renunciation of the rigour of His word. Against *such* trouble and such temptation the Lord arms us beforehand: He teaches us to perceive and bethink ourselves that he who will not be holily loved, and return our love, cannot even by God Himself be overcome and constrained; He sets before us as proof the pattern and testimony of His own treatment in this evil world. "If the most holy love upon earth fared no better, if He did not succeed, if He could not in His wisdom avoid hatred when it arose against Him, all the more fiercely as His pure love more brightly beamed upon it—How could *we* hope altogether to escape this hatred? Or do we vainly imagine that we can surpass the love and the prudence of our Lord?" (Dietz.)

In the same sense as in ch. vii. 7 Jesus had already spoken of the hatred of the world, being constrained to utter to His *unbelieving brethren* the mournful word, The world *cannot* hate *you*, because ye still belong to it;—He now assures His believing and devoted disciples on the other side, The world *cannot* love you, it must hate you *as* it hates *Me!* That is the presupposed ground for the abruptly beginning, *If* it hate you—spoken rather for the future than the present, like everything in these discourses. These poor disciples had hitherto but little experienced the direct hatred of the world against *their* unimportant persons; that which their Master had foretold, when He sent them on their trial mission (Matt. x.), still waited for the main part of its accomplishment; it was probably almost forgotten before, but must now have been revived in their re-

membrance. But that the world hated *Jesus*, and already for some time had threatened His death, they knew very well: see ch. xi. 8. Of that He now says γινώσκετε: think well what this means, and what will follow from it to yourselves; that ye may know and prepare to suffer that hatred which will be essential to My discipleship. Πρῶτον ὑμῶν is to be taken adverbially—*before* you, even if it follows the form of ch. i. 15 πρῶτός μου.[1] And in this is already intimated, for the reflecting γινώσκειν, the immediately afterward expounded *cause* of the hatred; for in the new *beginning* which the Lord introduced—in which He provoked and experienced the full hatred of the world—lies also the *ground* of a similar relation for His followers as belonging to Him. In connection with which it is self-understood that to our pondering the Lord's words as it were run on—And nevertheless *love* this world, as I have loved it!

Ver. 19. Five times with emphasis is the *world* mentioned in this single verse. Would ye then—this is what the Lord designs so strongly to emphasize—rather be loved of the world? That would be wretched indeed; for then—ye *would be* also of the world! (1 Jno. iv. 5.) The οὐκ εἶναι ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου, which in ch. viii. 23 He had asserted of Himself (even there, properly speaking, humbling Himself to a level with His disciples, in opposition to the unbelievers and evil), He now most expressly for the first time attributes to His own. They are, indeed, in the world, and were to remain in it, like His kingdom, and like Himself at first (ch. xiii. 1, xvii. 14–18; 1 Jno. iv. 17)—but no more from and of the world, since He had chosen them, and implanted in them a new principle of life from above, since they had become branches of the Vine planted by the Father upon the earth. If they were still of the world, the world would love *its own*—but that is not merely as it is superficially and generally interpreted, Because like

[1] Cyril, Cajetan, Cocceius would translate principem vestrum; and Calvin preferred this—that Christ, although the greatest and highest, and so far above them, nevertheless escaped not the enmity of the world. But we hold fast, with Syr., Vulg., Nonnus, and most others, the more simple view: I have *gone before* you in this, have broken *this* path! De Wette: I have first undergone this lot, let this be your comfort.

seeks like. (Ecclus. xiii. 15–17.) Euthymius indeed comments in that style: *χαίρει γὰρ τῷ ὁμοίῳ τὸ ὅμοιον*—and in van Ess it is concisely translated, "*you as* their fellows." But *τὸ ἴδιον* is not just *τὸ ὅμοιον*; a much deeper thought lies in this expression. It is the manner of the world to seek *its own;* therefore where and when it *loves*, it is the character of this false, so-called "love," which in its selfishness contradicts the nature of all true love, that it in others essentially seeks only *its own.* (Comp. on Matt. v. 46.) Therefore the Lord selects His expression, as we see when we examine it closely: this world would—not indeed love *you* (for it cannot truly *love* at all!)—but *its own in you*, that is, so far and so long as it finds that in you. And this leaves room for Lampe's remark, which contains a truth attested by experience: "It is not indeed sincere love, but mere *φιλαυτία*, in that the world loves in the worldly what is its own. For although worldly men often quarrel fiercely, which is one of the characteristics of corrupt nature, Tit. iii. 3, yet these enmities are only about particular conflicting interests. *In the great essentials there is always a perfect accord among them.*" Even he who holds with the world must not expect for his own person only love and peace; it is only where opposition to Christ and the kingdom of God is concerned that the world will recognise its principle in him and altogether hold his side.

The first thing, on the other hand, which provokes the world's hatred is the aim to be different and better—which is given here at first in the *ἐξελεξάμην*: the world feels itself aggrieved and injured by such a pretension to election, and repels it as pride—until, comforted by the thought that it is only *pretension*, it falls back upon its own again. But when the world cannot but know that we no longer *are* of it, and, more than that, as we *testify*, through that *Christ* whom the world from the beginning (*πρῶτον*) hated—then indeed is its full hatred excited. *Διὰ τοῦτο* thus refers (as ver. 18 already deduced this conclusion from *ἐμέ* to *ὑμᾶς*) specifically to the previous prominent *ἐγώ*, in which B.-Crusius could find no direct significance. It has indeed a twofold important significance. First, as we have said—It is the ground of their strongest hatred that *I* have robbed the world of you. Again, it gives the disciples a whole-

some remembrancer, in order to quell all hatred and counter-scorn on their part (just as Tit. iii. 2–5), that even they were formerly φύσει (Eph. ii. 1–3) children of the world; and thus with great emphasis ascribes their ἐκλέγεσθαι altogether to *Himself*. For we must take into account, what is declared ch. xvii. 6 and will there be expounded, that these disciples at least were already, previously to their last decisive calls to Jesus, τέκνα θεοῦ of the old covenant; nevertheless the Lord says, including this also—I have chosen you out of the world: just as in Matt. xxiii. 37 He shows Himself to have ever been the source of all calling to Jerusalem and Israel. Thus the ἐγώ has a twofold emphasis: as to the *world*, its hatred is reduced into hatred against Himself; as to the *disciples*, it is correspondingly impressed upon them, that He alone is the origin of their new life, even that of their preparatory election.

Thus in the explanatory διὰ τοῦτο the hatred of the world becomes to us a precious *note* that we are His. Not indeed the first or the only mark; that is rather the *loving one another*, the *continuing in His love* until we, like Himself, can love the hating world. As the *second* note, it neither begins our test, nor must we seek it or wish it; but *if*, alas, it incessantly comes, *then* it is time to comfort ourselves in the reflection that the love of the world would be a sad condemnation: Luke vi. 26; Gal. i. 10; Jas. iv. 4, etc.

Ver. 20. An explanatory *remember* follows *ye know*. It is the Lord's will that we should forget no word ever spoken by Him. Yet λόγος has here the specific meaning of *adagium*, as in ch. iv. 37, and as we shall afterwards find in ver. 25. The application now given to this saying is by no means a new one (see already Matt. x. 24, 25), by no means an altogether different one from ch. xiii. 16 (to which the εἶπον ὑμῖν primarily refers); for we saw that even there something of the same kind was the undertone of meaning. But it has a subtile significance which few find in it,—that the Lord reckons here as His own honour the being hated and persecuted, and suffering: He experienced all this not merely as πρῶτος, but as κύριος, as Lord and Head. Consequently, the consolation has an undertone of demand, that they should rejoice and feel themselves honoured in being counted worthy to suffer as He suffered. (Acts v. 41;

1 Pet. iv. 13, 14.) Should we be, *would* we be, *less* than He? "Thus it belongs to the *perfection* of a disciple, who would be as his Master, that he should encounter the hatred of the world" —as Braune excellently brings out this neglected meaning.

The εἰ in the following specific unfolding of the general λόγος is of course ætiological, as the εἰ and the ὅτι in the previous verse; it is founded upon those previous sayings, and presupposes them. *If* ye are My servants and followers, then must that other immediately hold good—*If* they have persecuted the Lord, they will also persecute the servant. The saying, which is repeated *e.g.* in 2 Tim. iii. 12, not only in general retains its truth, but so absolutely that no one can be excepted; although a superficial understanding of it has led to much anxious questioning whether the discipleship of one not actually persecuted can be genuine.[1] For there is a very subtile (often all the more keen on that account) διώκειν, even as there is a very honourable and seemingly Christian world around us; but the *hatred* of the heart, consequently also its expression, against all who would with all their soul live godly in Christ Jesus, is never wanting. The general tolerance of a tolerant world is always grazing the limits of its liberality, where its secret principle becomes manifest, and its concealed hatred to Christ in His people must break out; when the *I have chosen you out of the world* is obtruded upon them in all its earnestness, then begins their exclusion, their ban, their rage.

But what of the τηρεῖν τὸν λόγον, which as thus connected with the διώκειν, has been the cause to expositors from the beginning, and to almost every reader, of so much trouble? The old expedient is well known, which Bengel also adopts,—that of taking, on account of the "parallel," τηρεῖν for παρατηρεῖν, thus maliciously to watch the words, to pervert them, etc. But there is no authority to be adduced for such a use of the word; the only passage, τηρήσει, Gen. iii. 15, is quite peculiar in its kind, and is moreover very uncertain; such places as Matt. xxvii. 36, 54 can be brought forward only through entire misunderstanding. It is out of the question to apply St John's τηρεῖν τὸν λόγον, retaining as it does the same sense throughout the

[1] As in many of the conferences at Barmen—and probably elsewhere.

Scriptures, in malam partem, and to give it an evil meaning.[1] Winer would help the matter by explaining the double clause as a general indefinite and hypothetic evolution of the one λόγος, viewed in two aspects. "Your lot will be like Mine: *but that can be only twofold*, persecution *or* acceptance. *The words themselves leave it undecided at the moment, which of these two lots befell Jesus.*" But this tame generalisation, which would leave that for a moment undecided which has just been so strongly declared, can do little to enlighten us; and it contradicts the spirit of that solemn and deep feeling in which the Lord speaks throughout this discourse. Indeed, even in οὐκ ἔστι μείζων as *here* used there lay a reference to διώκειν and μισεῖν. It is not merely—He has no *other* fate, only if the Lord finds *acceptance*, the servant finds it. To translate, with Kuinoel: si meam doctrinam *observassent*, Lücke rightly declares to be wholly incorrect; for this would require also a *si persecuti essent*, the εἰ, connected as it is with the εἰ and ὅτι of ver. 19, would lose its entire force, and the whole saying its decisive earnestness. Lücke agrees with Winer in allowing no irony here, and thinks (though disagreeing with Winer in this) that it was left to the disciples to draw the conclusion that they would *chiefly* experience persecution (though also, with that, some slight acceptance), like Himself. Quite right, if only the εἰ did not stand in each case in so manifestly *contrasting* a sense, so that in both cases, in the διώκειν or in the τηρεῖν, their *entire* lot is embraced! This last meaning is necessarily obtruded upon us in spite of ourselves; quite other would be, *In as far as* it has persecuted Me,—*as much* or *as little as* it has kept My words or accepted Me.[2] The subject of ἐδίωξαν and ἐτήρησαν is manifestly quite the same, the *hating world* now referred to in the plural. And

[1] Braune, whom we quoted before with approbation, here follows Rieger in his error, who (after Bengel) could write:—It provokes those who have the power to *persecution*, others to *crafty spying*.

[2] Many, however, contend, with all kinds of applications, for an earnest promise of some measure of acceptance for their words. Olshausen: "But as many have kept My word, so will there be some who will receive yours." B.-Crusius: "They will be believing *and* unbelieving in regard to you, even as they have been in regard to Me"—which, perceiving his difficulty, he defends thus: "The subject of both clauses is *men* generally, not the world; hence, designedly, the Plural." But how came that to be the case just this

the literal phraseology must be violently forced if we would evade the ironical sense, a too sensitive opposition to which is the cause of much of the error here. This keen irony and nothing else is the undeniable meaning of the striking words, which by εἰ ἐτήρησαν speak of something that had *not* taken place as if it had.[1] The consolatory reference to an acceptance for their words, at least among some, has no place, according to our feeling, in this verse, nor generally in the whole discourse from ver. 18 to ver. 25. Ver. 21 obviously goes on with ταῦτα πάντα concerning persecution alone. The words deal exclusively with the *world*, not with the believers in the midst of it; they, rather, are already reckoned with the disciples themselves. Thus Grotius correctly: "If they have heard Me, ye may expect that they will hear you. *As if He should say, There is no ground to expect it.*" (Hirschb. Bibel: As little as they have received My word, so little, etc.) And Lampe: "There is a sorrowful meaning in the words." And he afterwards assents to those qui censent ironicum subesse sensum, quasi dixerit: "*As miserably as* they have kept My word, will they keep yours!"

This view will perfectly justify itself as the only correct one, when we finally consider how and for what purpose the *word* is here introduced. We may say at once that as the discourse is of standing and testifying against the world (ch. vii. 7), first in the Lord's own case, and then in theirs, *person* and *word* must come in juxtaposition. The person is persecuted; their word is —received and kept? See in what a manner they have received it already! Comp. the intimation of 1 Jno. iv. 5: they *speak of* the world and the world heareth them. But we speak the truth, which is of God; and *that* is the real cause of their enmity —in order that they may not be constrained to accept the word,

once? Von Gerlach: "Most had persecuted Him, yet some few had kept His word. *In the same relation*, and in no other, were they to hope for success!" That would be ὅσοι, ὅσῳ or ἐφ' ὅσον but not εἰ. Fikenscher still more recklessly: "Jesus had found true followers, and the servants of the Lord should never bear witness to His grace in vain." Braune, finally, entirely agrees with Lücke.

[1] Luthardt's protest against the irony is scarcely justified by his flat *hypothetical* view: "The disciples were to answer for themselves, which of these two cases would hold good here!" We are obstinate enough to find even in this no other than an ironical tone.

they persecute the person. Tholuck: "The ungodly minded man might probably, seeing that he cannot altogether suppress the conviction that the thorough Christian is a noble exhibition, let him alone or even give him his commendation, if he would only talk of his Christianity as something individually his own, and as it were a natural gift." Ah, but the testimony—Ye are the world, the grace of Christ hath saved me from it, save ye yourselves from this untoward generation!—As the Lord uses the words τὸν ὑμέτερον λόγον, He seems to say these two things: Let not their hatred cause you to keep back this word; but, also, Oppose the world with your word *alone*, do nothing more, for the rest suffer patiently, as I have suffered, all that may be done unto you?[1]

Ver. 21. Now comes the explanation by a second διὰ τοῦτο, which now first properly penetrates to the true ground of the whole. Him, the Son of the Father, abiding, living in eternal love, who would make all sinners His friends—Him, the great Helper and Saviour—to hate and to persecute, and carry on their increasing persecution upon His followers too! Whence and wherefore is this? The answer is, For *His* name's sake *we* are persecuted;—but He also first, because they know not His Father who sent Him, that is, they will not know Him, they hate Him in their inexcusable *sin*. But this sin is practical, persevering, opposing *unbelief*, which only in the abyss finds its true cause or causelessness. This is the connection and the substance of the whole down to ver 25. The ἀλλά gives so far *the reason*, as it takes away the ground of their astonishment, and by a disclosure of the true principle of the world's hatred, *consoles* their minds. He had elsewhere testified to them, Matt. x. 22, xxiv. 9 (comp. Matt. v. 11, ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ) that His disciples, for His name's sake, because He inwardly and essentially lives in them, and by their external testimony is avowed by them, should be persecuted; so is it here in vers. 18–20, and therefore ver. 21 does not any longer lay the emphasis upon that, but upon the declaration ὅτι οὐκ οἴδασι. Thus the ἀλλὰ is not spoken, as it were, because the disciples might have thought that for

[1] Hiller: "Here is no room for Elias' fire; for if the Lord has patience, what is His servant's duty?"

their own sakes all this would befall them.[1] Church history, from the earliest persecutions down to the present time, furnishes proof that the confession of the name of Jesus, yea this hated *name* itself, has always been the exciting cause of hatred. It holds good now as formerly—Apud Christianos nomen damnatur, non crimen.

Ταῦτα πάντα connects itself—in proof, too, that in the accompanying clause nothing else was predicted—only with the *διώκειν*, as the *ποιεῖν τινι* (or if Lachmann's reading, *εἰς ὑμᾶς*, be genuine, the *ποιεῖν εἰς*—) manifestly proves. But the enlarged *ταῦτα* contains the presupposal or declaration that the *διώκειν* will include or bring with it many individual acts of evil; see afterwards ch. xvi. 2, 3. *Οὐκ οἴδασι* stands absolutely, without doubt; and not simply as meaning that they do not acknowledge God in the particular character of the Sender of Jesus. See on ch. v. 37, vii. 28, viii. 19, 54, 55. They say, indeed, that He is their God, but they know Him not. This God hath *sent* Jesus, that is, into the world that the world might be saved, consequently also *to them;* but this they know and acknowledge not, because they will not *believe* Him. This is included as the undertone; but for the first the not knowing is specifically brought forward, in order in the *following* verse to press it further: "Ignorance would be otherwise an excuse"—but *here* it is in the fullest sense *inexcusable.*[2]

Ver. 22. Before all things we must seek the pregnant meaning of *ἁμαρτίαν οὐκ εἶχον* in ch. ix. 41, and refer to what was there said. Sin enough they have, forsooth; but all their sin, from their original depravity through all their opposition to God's commands and unbelief in His promise, their lie and hypocrisy, and all the evil deeds in which they were entangled,

[1] *We* may, indeed, make another application of the isolated saying: This hatred does not touch you and your various failings, but the name of the Lord!

[2] The *οὐ γὰρ οἴδασι τί ποιοῦσι*, spoken from the cross, has quite a different and milder meaning. Hence Dietz introduces the thought into our present text erroneously, when he says, "The world could *dare* to persecute the name of Jesus only because Jesus is not to it the Son of God." For the not knowing *here* is at the same time a well knowing, a not willing to know in spite of all conviction, and *therefore* a hating. As is undeniably proved by ver. 23.

would have been forgiven and taken away through Christ, if they had received Him in faith. Luther's marginal note goes at first not far enough: "Through Christ original sin is taken away, and since His coming condemns none but those who will not let it be taken away, that is, who will not believe." (Only afterwards in this "not letting" he corrects himself by including all actual sin.) That the only remaining, imputed *sin*, of which Christ speaks,[1] is no other than *unbelief*, appears through the whole of St John's Gospel, and in the connection of these last discourses especially (see our analysis), as it is decisively confirmed by ch. xvi. 9. De Wette strangely thinks that this takes away all meaning from the clause;—but this is its meaning, and it cannot be enough pondered that after the ἦλθον and ἐλάλησα of Christ all the sins of unbelieving sinners are concentrated into, confirmed and consummated by this unbelief alone. The sentence does not, indeed (and this we remark against Alford), make the idle assertion, If I had not come they would not have fallen into the sin of unbelief; but, Unbelief would not have become their last, complete, and ruining *sin*. For it is obvious of itself that in the condemnation of unbelief, all former sin is included as unforgiven. And here we may, once more, draw our own conclusion, whether all the heathen, to whom Jesus has not come and to whom He has not spoken, can be condemned, when even Israel falls into judgment not before, and only because, they had heard and seen the works and words of Jesus in vain! (Comp. Matt. xi. 21–24.) It is plainly enough to be observed, how the Lord here places Himself by a great distinction above all other messengers speaking from God who had come before Him; as also that, while all previous persecution and opposition might have been forgiven, the rejection of Himself alone definitively precluded all salvation.

In the ἦλθον the entire public, witnessing, and working manifestation of the Lord is embraced, and placed first: in the ἐλάλησα is embraced, with like comprehensiveness, primarily the testifying word, as "belonging to the full idea of the *coming*;"—as previously in ver. 20. Not, with Luther, And had

[1] In Nonnus: ἀλιτροσύνη νεμεσήμων, blasphemy meeting its appropriate vengeance.

told them this—although the meaning comes almost to the same. For, *spoken to them*[1] means: All that was to be discoursed and spoken to them, withholding nothing of the whole counsel of God, pointing out to them their sins and the way of their salvation. Not every one, indeed, in every corner of the land fell under this condemnation, if without fault of his the Lord had not come to him, and uttered His words in his hearing; but, on the other hand, there were many of whom it might be said, they *might* and they *ought* to have heard Him;—all sincere consciences would have felt, "Let us hear Him first."

But now they can bring nothing forward to excuse their sin: we would hold to this translation of Luther [vorwenden], as also the Berlenb. Bible, Bengel, Stolz, and de Wette, who retain "pretence," while other modern translators place instead "excuse," or "excuse themselves." We should expect, after the analogy of Rom. i. 20, the denial of a grounded, valid excuse; hence the Vulg. excusationem (which Erasmus changes to: quod prætexant), while Theophyl. explains πρόφασις by ἀπολογία. Klee also thinks that the word can signify only a *sound* apology. How does it then stand? Certainly πρόφασις means fundamentally only *prætextus*, *obtentus*, an *evasion*, that which only *says* to conceal or defend something thereby—a sense which the verb προφασίζομαι retains. Stephanus pointed out, and Lampe quotes him for the general ἀπολογία, that the expression generally was used as a juridical term bono maloque sensu promiscue; but in the legal domain this might have been a catachrestical transition of the meaning, and in that way the passages in Eurip. might be explained. And there are not wanting other decisive passages—not merely where the word passes over into the idea of "occasion, circumstance causing, reason"[2] (Hesych. αἰτία, Syr. in our passage עִלְּתָא), but where the truth of the πρόφασις is expressly acknowledged, as Demosth. xviii. 156, τὴν μὲν ἀληθῆ πρόφασιν, Thucyd. i. 23, ἀληθεστάτη πρόφασις. But we maintain, nevertheless, that in the New Testament the latter unusual signification can scarcely be assumed, and that St John has used πρόφασις in its common and rigorous meaning. Compare the body of passages in the New Testament,

[1] Only not, with Pfenninger: persuaded them!

[2] Mediated by, "what could be stated about it."

e.g., especially Acts xxvii. 30, and the very plain antithesis in Phil. i. 18, εἴτε προφάσει εἴτε ἀληθείᾳ. Schöttgen (ed Spohn) would pave the way for *excusatio* in John xv. 22, by a reference to the more general *causa*, *ratio*, in 1 Thess. ii. 5, where ἐν προφάσει is taken, as parallel with ἐν λόγῳ, for a mere paraphrase of the substantive connected with it: so also Koppe and Rosenmüller. But almost all other expositors adhere here also to *prætextus*, as Bengel, see on this subject Olshausen.[1] We regard Matt. xxiii. 14 as the true parallel. Thus the New Testament uses πρόφασις only for *pretext*, as Wahl admits, placing this passage at the head. And in this word of our Lord there lies a subtile and important thought, which *for Israel* overpasses that εἶναι ἀναπολογήτους of the heathen. Israel, the clearer the testimony which it ever has (not merely in the conscience) against its sin, seeks in its pharisaical degeneracy pretexts to oppose that testimony; it is, as it were, the people of πρόφασις in the largest sense. Our law and our God, their honour—this is what they hold up now against the Lord, to conceal their hatred to the truth and love revealed in Him. But the Lord now says, as emphatically as truly, that this pretext (before God, and man, and their own conscience) is also taken away: no more can they with any authority and reason defend themselves by any pretended plea, still less can they vindicate or excuse themselves. The πρόφασις falls away, the ἁμαρτία of μισεῖν τὸν θεόν is disclosed! That, moreover, in the crucifixion of Christ the hypocritical arbitrary pretext first takes its culminating form; as, also, that in many individuals, who in various degrees of good conscience are opposed to Him, like Saul, some answer to the great question put to Israel, τί με διώκεις;[2] might be admitted as actual ἀπολογία and αἰτία—is by no means denied by our Lord's words. For the νῦν δέ, of which the Lord speaks, is proleptical; its fulfilment begins in the testimony of the Spirit, which glorifies all the words and works of Jesus to faith, but opposes them to unbelief (ch. xvi.

[1] Luther's indistinct translation is now corrected—with dissembled covetousness. Berlenb. with pretext of covetousness. De Wette: covetous hypocrisy.

[2] Mark, however, the quite general sense of this expression as used to Saul!

9), and has been ever since going on in Israel, as in the Christendom which resembles it.

Ver. 23. This is one more of the many consequences which result from the unity of the Father and the Son—the most lamentable of them all! He that seeth Me, seeth—he that believeth in Me, believeth in—he that loveth Me, loveth—he that *hateth* Me, hateth—*the Father!* See also Lu. x. 16, previously. He that *can* hate Jesus, the manifestation of God in the flesh, must bear in himself hatred to God—how else could that be possible? Thus it is not so much the consequence drawn, as an inference back to the true principle underlying the *πρόφασις*.[1] Just so he that hateth the disciples of the Lord, only confirms and declares his hatred to the Lord Himself. The Jews did hate God *before*, for as faith begets love, so unbelief bears hatred; but now they also hate Him as the Father and Sender of Jesus Christ. The order of our Lord's thought here coincides specifically with that of Ps. lxix. afterwards quoted, a psalm which predicts the judgment of Israel's hardening and rejection: See there, ver. 10, חֶרְפּוֹת חוֹרְפֶיךָ נָפְלוּ עָלָי. As the Lord was zealous for the honour of God in Israel, all the scorn and blasphemy with which Israel contradicted their God falls as suffering upon *His* head. (Rom. xv. 3.) That all this destiny was not accomplished once for all in Israel, but as the type and beginning of the future hatred of the *world* to the disciples of Jesus down to the end of the world,—has been made plain by the spirit of the discourse since ver. 18, and is now brought to remembrance by the general formula *ὁ ἐμὲ μισῶν*. Is it not so? "To the world the personality of God is itself a dismal idea"—says Fikenscher here. That is, His living holy personality; not the imagined delusion of a God which they call "their God," and even (as ch. viii. 41 exhibits to them) without and against Christ, although only from His words, "their Father"—just as the modern Jews. If, nevertheless, the living per-

[1] This is plainly what Luthardt means: "As they hate Christ, they hate God; therein was the greatness of their sin to be seen." How then can he contradict me afterwards, "*Not* because they hate God, hate they Christ." (Stier)? Would that the worthy writer read more carefully! What could be plainer than "not so much the consequence drawn, as the inference back?"

sonal God appears before them in the πρόσωπον of the Son, humbling Himself to them, and effectually witnessing to them His truth, then is the hatred of the haters only made manifest.

Ver. 24. To the previous λαλεῖν, which had already been referred to as conclusive for the condemnation of unbelief, the ἔργα are now added, quite in the sense and spirit of ch. v. 36, x. 37. Not that ver. 22 is in any way retracted, as having said too much: for even there the ἦλθον of our Lord's entire personality included also the works, and here the works are *not simply* the miracles. Thus what now follows, is, properly speaking, only a confirmation of what had before been said, exhibiting more clearly its reason, and more sharply defining its character. We must not undervalue the strength of the evidence of miracles, against our Lord's plain utterance; but we must understand His words, as we have abundantly shown already, that the strength and significance of these special ἔργα must be closely connected with His holy life and His true words. Augustin incorrectly understood ἐν αὐτοῖς to mean *in them;* and further interpreted (followed, too, by Thomas Aquinas) *in eorum corporibus*, a restriction to His healing beneficence which is here altogether out of place. Ἐν αὐτοῖς must rather be completed by ὧν, as in ch. xii. 35, comp. ver. 37, ἔμπροσθεν αὐτῶν. (Syr. has here לעיניהון, before their eyes: Nonn. αὐτῶν δερκομένων ὅτε μάρτυρες ἦσαν ὀπωπαί.) Hence again, Acts ii. 22, ἐν μέσῳ ὑμῶν. Such works as *none other* had done:[1] they themselves admitted this, ch. vii. 31, ix. 32. Not only so *many* (ch. x. 32) but so *great*,[2] and further, so entirely *benevolent:* never any miracles of punishment, as in the case of former workers of miracles; altogether in harmony with His entire life, such as never before had been exhibited in sinful man. Hence it is needless and perverting to refer the *no other* to false prophets who had done *nothing* of this kind; this would be here a very strange thought. The twice redoubled καί has a great emphasis in the defining of all their ἁμαρτία; but on that very

[1] The question between πεποίηκεν and ἐποίησεν makes no difference, though the latter would more strictly suit the past.

[2] Lampe: Nodum in scirpo quærunt Augustinus et Beda, putantes non posse proprie dici, quod Jesus majora Mose et Prophetis fecerit, sed solum quod plura.

account it is not to be taken each time in precisely the same sense. *Καὶ ἐμὲ καὶ τὸν πατέρα μου* is explained by ver. 23 to mean—not merely Me, but in that also—*like* Me, the Father. On the other hand, in the first *καὶ ἑωράκασι καὶ μεμισήκασι* there lies, on account of the positive and strong *μεμισήκασι*, something more than in the similar formula, ch. vi. 36, where the translation is no more than, Although—nevertheless. Here the contrast is carried to its extreme point—My works, *Me* (and the Father) in them—*to see* and yet *to hate;*[1] these two irreconcilables are reconciled by a God-hating world! (as Lücke has well expressed it.)

Ver. 25. Once more an *ἀλλὰ*, which, like the former in ver. 21, obviates offence, and answers the objection—How is this possible, and permitted by God? The last *solace for* the fearful, actual hatred to Christ which the God-hating world exhibits (and which first fully manifested itself in Israel) lies in the counsel of the Divine wisdom which foretold all this, as the Scripture declares. At the same time is included: So little do they effect by their hatred and persecution, that they rather only fulfil the Scripture, while they themselves must draw upon themselves the judgments written in that Scripture.

The citation, which is introduced by the frequent recitative *ὅτι*, and unhesitatingly changes for the present occasion the *οἱ μισοῦντές με* into *ἐμίσησάν με*, may be sought for in Ps. lxix. 4, or xxxv. 19. We have shown that we prefer a direct reference to Ps. lxix.; for this is a Psalm which is elsewhere frequently interpreted in a Messianic sense (Jno. ii. 17; Rom. xv. 3, xi. 9, 10; Acts i. 20), and has other uninterpreted references to Christ, of which we will mention only vers. 9 and 22. *Δωρεάν*, as the LXX. used it in this *λόγος*, means *not* "without *result*" (as Bengel has: *in vain*); but simply—*without cause.* This is absolutely true only in the sacred Son of God, who hath nothing in Him which could provoke hatred; if His types or successors can appropriate the same complaint, it can be only *in as far* as they are in Him.

In Ps. lxix. 5, as in xxxv. 19, this sense of חִנָּם is explained by the parallel אוֹיְבַי שָׁקֶר, *ἀδίκως*, as also by the frequent recurrence of the same or a similar expression. The sixty-ninth Psalm

[1] Not, They have seen *it* or *them*, but *ἑωράκασι* belongs to *καὶ ἐμὲ κ.τ.λ.*

certainly belongs to those which prophesy less directly than typically of Christ; for we must make this distinction, although the most direct prophecy has something typical in it, and the transition generally is very undefined. Compare closely the strictly related Ps. xxxv. (see especially vers. 11, 12, 17), which also *might* have been quoted in the New Testament.[1] It is obvious that we must think of this Psalm, too, in our passage; and we think that, with many others, it is included in the reference, though Ps. lxix. is pre-eminently applicable. The mere typical nature of this prophecy to be fulfilled, is indicated by ὁ λόγος ὁ γεγραμμένος, not merely τὸ γεγραμμένον. We would not, with Surenhusen, by any means take it for the allegationis formula מה שנאמר, quæ adhibere solebat quando ad rem sub-obscure indicatam alludebatur (for Ps. lxix. at least speaks in almost the plainest terms of the Messiah)—but, on account of the γεγραμμένος added, would assign to the λόγος the same specific meaning as in ver. 20, that of a recurring sentence, a proverbial word. Compare, besides Ps. lxix. 5 and xxxv. 19, also Ps. xxxviii. 20, cix. 3, cxix. 78, 86, as also Ps. vii. 5, xxv. 3 (רֵיקָם temere, sine causâ).[2] The added ἐν τῷ νόμῳ αὐτῶν, further, has here an intense meaning, just as in chap. x. 34, we found in it more than mere νόμος instead of γραφή. Bengel: in lege eorum, quam assidue terunt et jactant.[3] But even this is not enough, while the "*bitter* irony" of de Wette—"they truly follow, indeed, what is in their law!"—is, on the other hand, too much. This would be too bitter here where the πρόφασιν οὐκ ἔχουσι gives us the fundamental thought and feeling of our Lord—Their hatred and unbelief are *inexcusable*, no longer to be *disguised* or *palliated!* Therefore, though the *undertone* of νόμος αὐτῶν may possibly be—On which they rely (against Me), thus indicating the πρόφασις they alleged; yet we cannot but think the *fundamental idea* to be that their law *testified against them*, that their Scripture, which gives the right utterance upon

[1] As we have observed in our Psalmenkommentar.

[2] But שֹׂנְאַי חִנָּם Ps. xxv. 19 is something different.

[3] Similarly Surenhusius: Vox αὐτῶν hic exprobrandi vim habet, *quasi cum iracundiâ quâdam*, ac si dixisset Jesus, *non miror* quod Judæi me gratis odio habebant, cum hoc jam diu dictum sit in lege ipsorum, in qua usque adeo gloriari solent, quod *ipsorum* lex sit.

everything, already most convictingly called their sin *by its right name.* This would be strictly parallel with Rom. iii. 19. All Scripture becomes a condemning law against Israel, because they have not believed and attained unto its promise. In this fearful μισεῖν δωρεάν reveals itself the satanic *groundlessness* of their sin, its nature as coming from the abyss; as hatred of God it has no further valid reason. For here it may be said, "In sin there is neither reason nor righteousness." (Berlenb. Bible.) It is remarkable that even the blind Talmudists were constrained to observe something peculiar in the שִׂנְאַת חִנָּם—while they do not acknowledge this guilt to have been consummated upon the Messiah who had come, they do regard it as in itself the heaviest guilt, and the true cause of their last long exile.[1]

THE TESTIMONY OF THE SPIRIT OF TRUTH AGAINST THE WORLD: PREDICTION TO OBVIATE OFFENCE.

(Ch. xv. 26–xvi. 4.)

All that has been said since ver. 18 was intended by our Lord to *console* His disciples beforehand in prospect of their oppression through the world's hatred; but this plain fore-anouncement, that nothing else awaited them, must at first have all the more terrified their already saddened hearts. He, therefore, goes back to the original *promise* which pervades all these discourses, that the Comforter and Helper would come. It was presupposed in vers. 20, 21, that the disciples would be hated like Himself, on account of their *word* which would confess *the name of the Lord.* He predicted this fate to them as His *witnesses.* It was obvious that they should think, But how shall we poor weak men persist in our testimony, yea, even begin it, in the face of such predicted hatred? and He confirms to them their vocation, and predicts to them with equal clearness that they

[1] In the Talm. hier. tract. Joma we find the question—Wherefore was the second temple, which certainly some righteous men served, laid waste? And the answer is, בְּסִבַּת שִׂנְאַת חִנָּם. For hatred without cause is worse than idolatry or blood-guiltiness.

should bear His testimony in the future. Not of themselves, however, and in their own human persons: the Paraclete will conduct the cause. He then, however, returns to the former again, and consoles them by the emphatic assurance,—That ye might not stumble at this, I have now (more clearly than ever before) *foretold to you* both the coming of the Spirit as a Witness against the hatred of the world, and at the same time the continuance of that hatred in spite of His testimony.

Ὅταν δὲ ἔλθῃ refers back to the already given promise, which is presupposed; here the all-embracing comforting name *παράκλητος*, and then the other, which as in chap. xiv. 16, 17, makes prominent a specific character—*πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας*.[1] The distinction and the new element in this saying lie first (as we remarked before) in the change of the expression—I will send Him unto you from the Father (in chap. xiv. 16, 26, the Father will give Him at My request, send Him in My name); and then in the peculiarity of the definition, which hints at a deep meaning and significance in the thought—*ὃ παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκπορεύεται*. If we take first the superficial connection of the most general meaning, we see plainly that after the Lord has mentioned the already known official name of the coming Person (co-ordinate with the Father and Himself), He goes on to apply, for the special consolation of His disciples, *two predicates of dignity* to this mighty Witness, unconquerable by the hating world. He is the Spirit of *truth* who yields to no lie and contradiction—and He comes *out from God*, yea (as we might at once view it) right immediately from the Father, out of His essence; consequently "His Divine power will be irresistible."[2]

The interpretation of Grotius, which would resolve the first *παρὰ τοῦ πατρός* with *πέμψω* into the more indefinite ex domo patris, ex cœlo, is certainly wrong; for *ἐγώ* and *πατρός* are the complement one of the other, and the same thing is said conversely which the former promise said—that in the Spirit's coming and being sent the Father and the Son are alike the source and cause. The *ἐκπορεύεται* afterwards certainly opens a deeper

[1] The *opposition* (just as there) belongs here to *παράκλητος*, not to *ὅν*—thus the Vulg. *spiritum* is wrong.

[2] As von Gerlach well expresses this first connecting thought.

ground (as Grot. himself admits) for the παρὰ τοῦ πατρός. This word, here alone used concerning the Holy Spirit (parallel with the ἐξέρχεσθαι of the Son) is assuredly something different from πέμπεται—for the Lord does not speak with rhetorical tautology, but in a well-weighed progression of language and thought. Luther's view, "Who both proceeded from the *Father* and is sent by *Christ*"—would give a very tame repetition of the ἐγὼ παρὰ τοῦ πατρός. The *present* which now follows the πέμψω, especially as accompanying πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας, manifestly is intended more closely to define and characterise the nature of this Spirit. It does not help us to take the ἐκπορεύεσθαι as a *figurative* expression—like a flowing water, or a stream proceeding from its fountain: this Olshausen does (after Chrysostom's Homily on the Holy Ghost), referring to the passages which speak of the Spirit as poured out or flowing forth. For, not to mention that *here*, where τὸ πνεῦμα is interposed between the personal designations παράκλητος and ἐκεῖνος, a figurative allusion is scarcely probable, the figure itself must presuppose a corresponding nature, and this would have to be further inquired into. Grotius translates with perfect propriety, de patris ipsius *substantiâ* procedit. Let all this be refuted by those who can refute it; the living impression of this striking word upon myself obliges me to maintain that we cannot limit it to a so-called *economical* procession or derivation of the Spirit from the Father; for that would be no other than the mere parallel πέμπεσθαι already rejected. The πέμπεσθαι belongs to the παράκλητος, to the πνεῦμα the ἐκπορεύεσθαι. Here, rather, by the side of and after the economical relation, the essential relation is also designedly defined; even as this discloses itself in that, and is the foundation of it. Although Lampe (whose weak reasons we are not now disposed to answer) at large, and Lücke with a peremptory sentence, denies this—the ἐκπορεύεσθαι is assuredly, like everything similar in St John concerning the relation between the Father and the Son, to be taken *metaphysically*.[1]

[1] This we hold still against Hofmann (Schriftbeweis i. 177), who would, with an arbitrary restriction, read, "The Spirit proceedeth from the Father, *when* Jesus sendeth Him"—as also against Luthardt, who follows him, and takes this word in its simple "historical" meaning. What can be the motive for taking all metaphysical statements away from Scripture,

But nothing beyond this would we now maintain, nor enter into the old and rather unwise contention concerning the *filioque*. Such questions must be fundamentally and comprehensively considered: otherwise, they should be modestly omitted.[1] The germs of the contention which divided the churches of the East and West were easily found in Trinitarian speculation. While the Greeks sought to establish the Unity in Trinity by referring all things back to the Father as the ἀρχή, they were disposed to limit the procession of the Holy Ghost to the Father alone; this suited the view which came at last to think of and define the Father as *working* (causa efficiens), the Son as *mediating*. Hence the formula, The Spirit proceedeth *from* the Father *through* the Son,—for there is only μία ἀρχὴ—τὸ πνεῦμα ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς ὑφίσταται. (Basil.)[2] In the West, on the other hand, the ὁμοούσιον, as opposed to all subordination, required as its consequence that the Spirit should proceed from the Son as well as the Father. Augustin, more profoundly and comprehensively thinking on the Trinity, could nevertheless not refrain from allowing a *principaliter de Patre* (de Trin. xv. 12). Indeed Theodoret (against Cyril's Anathemas) repudiates altogether the saying that the Spirit has His existence from the Son or through the Son—appealing to Jno. xv. 26 and 1 Cor. ii. 12. All this properly belongs to the defence against Arian notions; and so intended, it is right. But what is the result of an unprejudiced speculation upon the dogma, of an investigation of the analogy of Scripture upon it, and of a calm consideration of this locus classicus in St John? The opposition to the *filioque* must be pronounced unfounded, in spite of some specious arguments on the other side, because the fundamental position cannot be broken, —that everything which the Father doeth and hath (save that He is the Father and begetteth the Son) is at once also appropriated to the Son. The Spirit is at the same time the unity of the Father and the Son. It would be an unsound subordination of

in opposition to the "ancient church" and the sanctified speculation of all ages?

[1] But we must partly agree with Thiersch (Kathol. u. Prot. ii. Aufl. 1. 228) that the profounder differences of this Trinitarian speculation cannot be decided from Scripture alone.

[2] Just as John Damasc. in the ἔκδοσις ἀκριβής.

the Son in the Holy Trinity, if the Spirit were not regarded as also of *His* essence. According to Rom. viii. 9; Gal. iv. 6; Phil. i. 19; 1 Pet. i. 11, the Spirit is wholly and entirely, even before the incarnation and glorification of the Son, *the Spirit of this Son.* In Rev. xxii. 1 (which has been compared) the stream of living water proceedeth from the throne of God *and of the Lamb.* Does the Lord then here (Jno. xv. 26) speak *exclusively* in παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκπορεύεται, or not, rather, *complementarily*, admitting therewith and presupposing a παρὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ. We think the latter only. "Not alone from the Father is the *proceeding forth* of the Spirit, but also from the Son: not alone from the Son is the sending of the Holy Spirit, but also from the Father." Thus does Klee, with excellent discrimination, point out the sense of this passage. As, supplying the lack of ch. xiv. 26, He has assumed for Himself the ἐγὼ πέμψω, He must now in order to guard on all sides the equal dignity of the holy Three-One, *not only* give the Father His right by the first παρὰ τοῦ πατρός which He therefore appends, but also, *in order to obviate all appearance of an exclusive subordination of the Spirit under Himself, the Son*, and to indicate the Spirit as of like Divine nature with the Son who *came forth from the Father* (ch. xvi. 28), expressly utter the ἐκπορεύεσθαι παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς which advances from the economical to the essential relation. This alone is the reason and the meaning of this utterance.[1] Here as the Son of man He has on His own part occasion to speak only of a πέμπειν. When, after His glorification, "the Spirit proceedeth from Him *in a new manner*," that is, mediated by His corporeity, it is not denied thereby, rather *presupposed* (Jno. xvii. 5) that the Spirit essentially proceedeth from the eternal Son, as from the Father. The determined opposition to the consistent *filioque*—which we would not regard, with Marheineke, as a *mera pertinacia*—can be treated with respect only when viewed as a fruit of narrow conscientiousness, determined to speak literally only in the letter of Scripture.

For the rest, in all dogmatic statement concerning the pro-

[1] In the same sense as in the confirmation of the Nicene Symbol. in the second council of Constant., the Spirit is named—τὸ κύριον, τὸ ζωοποιοῦν, τὸν ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον, συμπροσκυνούμενον καὶ συνδοξαζόμενον πατρὶ καὶ υἱῷ.

cession of the Spirit in the interior of Deity, we hold generally with Lampe: "Which mystery, as it is past explication, is to be profoundly adored; and, in the silence of Scripture, we are not willing to obscure, and perchance to dishonour, it by scholastic terms of definition." As also with the well-known words of Melanchthon (Loc. Com.): "We do better to adore, than to investigate, the mysteries of the Godhead.—The Most High God hath clothed His Son in flesh, that He might lead us away from the contemplation of His majesty to the contemplation of our own flesh, and so of our own weakness." This is the cause why the dogmatics thus inaugurated were so practical.

Ἐκεῖνος μαρτυρήσει περὶ ἐμοῦ—this is even here the main point to which our Lord directs attention. Had not the Scripture long ago borne witness of Him, and similarly the Father in the works? And the Son also of Himself? Quite true, and yet when the Spirit so comes as He had never before been in the world, there begins a consummate, final, and so far quite new testimony, which seals and glorifies all others. The Spirit shows us the Son and His works in a new and clear light; He opens the ancient Scripture; He even creates a new Scripture which was wanting to the Old as its consummation. "He will testify *of Me*"—mark here, as we rightly said upon ch. xiv., that this *παράκλητος* carries on the interest of God, that is, of Christ with us (with the disciples and the world) primarily as the present Representative, who speaketh for the departed Lord (Grotius: actor caussæ *suæ*). While He thus previously testifies of Christ to the disciples themselves, and then *through* them to the world, He becomes at the same time a Counsellor, Helper, Intercessor, Representative, *for* the disciples.

Ver. 27. *How* will He then testify, and *what?* The answer to this question now follows: He will not immediately (by any personal manifestation as the Son) bear witness, but in and through you: further, He will testify that which ye have already seen in Me, that which ye have already heard of Me —nothing besides, essentially different or new. By this we have the way paved for an answer to a question which has been so hard and misleading to many, Whether the Lord here lays down a *distinction* between the two testimonies, that of the Spirit and that of the disciples, and what is the nature of that

difference? Assuredly there is, in the first place, *no* distinction, in as far as the preceding ἐκεῖνος μαρτυρήσει actually embraces, of itself and as standing first, the whole testimony. The καὶ ὑμεῖς appears plainly to be based upon that, following first when He had fully come. The disciples were directed to wait for this, see Lu. xxiv. 49; Acts i. 8; and comp. John xx. 21, 22. Hence B.-Crusius (whose commentary as it proceeds becomes more and more rationalistic) says very incorrectly, "Here the higher and the mere human faculty of the disciples are distinguished, and placed *by the side of* each other!" O no, what their mere human power was χωρὶς Χριστοῦ, that is, without the Spirit who first fully united them with Him, we have seen in ver. 5. And what Euthymius with a good intention says is not careful and precise enough, ἐπάγει παραμυθίαν, λέγων ὅτι τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον συνεργήσει αὐτοῖς. Nor is the distinction well-considered which many orthodox writers labour to establish, between the direct witness of the Spirit by His manifestation (the visible signs at the outpouring, the miracles, etc.), and the words of the Apostles. For signs and wonders are, again, as in regard to Christ so also in regard to the Spirit, no testimony in themselves, but become such in their confirmation of the word, Mark xvi. 20; Heb. ii. 3, 4. The disciples bear witness as the first recipients of the Spirit, who testifies in their persons, who speaks and offers Himself to others through their words. In μαρτυρεῖτε after μαρτυρήσει we are not to seek, with Bengel, an antithesis between the *present* and the future—for how far were the disciples at that time from testifying to the world! But Lücke is right, that this *present* expresses and confirms "their abiding vocation as witnesses," although that was not to be fully established until a time still in the future, though near. After the great *when* of the previous verse, the sense of this is plain —*Then shall ye* actually bear witness, who are now already fore-elected to that office. And more, then will your testimony be the testimony of the Spirit, who will make you infallible *in this vocation and function.*

This must be established in our minds, and never lost sight of, in respect to the unity of the testimony. We have nothing here of de Wette's "two distinct views lying at the foundation, the natural and supernatural!" Rightly understood, indeed,

the whole appended clause with καὶ ὑμεῖς does establish a distinction in the unity of the testimony; this is most decisively settled if the δέ (Erasm.: Quin et vos) is taken to be genuine, and, independently of that, by the final and plain words, Because ye have been with Me from the beginning. Does not this refer to the human-personal character of the Apostles especially, and does it not consequently assign to this a peculiar relation to the testimony? We should not indeed translate, with the Berl. Bible, "for *that* (your appointment to bear witness) is the reason why ye have been within Me from the beginning, and as such is now confirmed at the end"—yet the meaning extends as far as this. To the eleven it afterwards rightly appeared as the first requirement for an Apostle (though they knew nothing then of the compensation for the lack of it which the Spirit would supply in Paul) that he should have been with Jesus from the beginning—ἀπ' ἀρχῆς αὐτόπτης καὶ ὑπηρέτης, Acts i. 21; Lu. i. 2 (which parallels explain the true meaning of ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, just as in Jno. xvi. 4, vi. 64, ἐξ ἀρχῆς). See, further, in Acts x. 39–41, the emphasis laid upon eye-witness of the life and acts of Jesus before and after His death; as also in Acts v. 39 the same distinction as in our present passage—*We* are witnesses, *and* so is the Holy Ghost. When we have first established it firmly in our minds that the former could never have taken place without the Holy Ghost, not only that the fishermen and publicans could never have come forward as witnesses without a pentecost for *their own* hearts, but that also without the demonstration of the Spirit and of power all their human personal testimony would have effected nothing, converted no souls, established no churches—then we may turn to the more direct consideration of the special nature and meaning of their *human-personal* testimony.

The excellent Olshausen strangely misses his way when he says that the disciples are exhibited as especial witnesses for the Lord—"only inasmuch as they were those who were the constant attendants upon Christ, and had opportunity to mark the most subtile movements of His inner being (?), and yet could never impute to Him any sin." Was it then with them, as with the centurion under the cross, that they were convinced ὄντως ὁ ἄνθρωπος οὗτος δίκαιος ἦν—and was that which no human eye-

witness could make absolutely certain to be made certain to the world by the word of venerating disciples? We prefer to think that the entire humanly manifested life and work of the Lord, so far as men might observe it and become actual witnesses for it, was committed to *historical evidence* through the records of the disciples (1 Jno. i. 2, 3)—and, on the other hand, that the conservation, attestation, communication, and diffusion of all the light and life of God which their history contains, was committed especially to the Spirit accompanying the word. Not a speculative idea after the notion of Baur,[1] but a historical fact, is the ground-work of the world's salvation; but God introduces the historical element historically into the world, as these plain Apostles who commend themselves to every man's conscience "as truth-loving men" *speak* simply and as men *that which they had seen and heard*, since they had been with Jesus. Thus their testimony as human persons, and as thus distinguished, refers especially to the human history of our Lord; but the same Spirit who made them capable of this by being their Remembrancer and Inspirer, infuses His own energy, which effects much more than a mere historical faith,[2] and further brings additional instruction and prophecy out of and upon the ground of the evangelical records. This distinction is therefore by no means the same which we express by the external, instrumental *word*, and the internally efficient *Spirit;* but where St Matthew and St John in their Gospels, and St Peter in his Epistle (2 Pet. i. 16–18) *relate*, each speaks precisely in the sense of our Lord's word which we are now considering—I am His witness (John xix. 35, xxi. 24)—where, however, St John in his Prologue, or St Paul in his Epistles, speaks something beyond that, there the Holy Ghost bears His own specific witness through them. *St Paul* assuredly is by this not "excluded from among the witnesses of our Lord" (as Münchmeyer strangely deduces from my ex-

[1] Whose hallucinations are wrecked upon this passage, as upon this entire Gospel. Speculative ideas without historical reality are ὑπέρογκα ματαιότητος, and of them the world had enough before Christ. But in the Gospel we have πεπληροφορημένα πράγματα, in St John as well as in St Luke.

[2] And even this, of course, the accompanying Spirit works. For to *this* history of the world, so long as it opposes the Spirit, refuses acceptance, in spite of *all other historical criticism:* hence, "The people think they have seen and heard it all, *but it is not yet true!*"

position)—but *his* testimony for the Lord is different from that of the eye-witnesses, and belongs only to that one first witness to which our Lord gives the first place in His saying. Here we are altogether at one with Lücke, whose words so appropriately meet the case, that we may quote them in full. "There were testimonies for Christ independently of immediate discipleship, as the testimony of St Paul. But the immediate testimony of the Spirit subsisted not without the historical testimony of Christ's body of disciples.[1] This latter was firmly established, even after the direct witnesses were removed, *in the writings* kept by the Church, as the permanent historical foundation for the former.[2] *To the absolute testimony of the Spirit* concerning Christ, which may be conceived as quite apart from the Apostles, is added the disciples' *historically to be preserved testimony*, that of the first witnesses." And if this last clause might appear one-sided (though it appears clearly enough included in καὶ ὑμεῖς δέ), Lücke supplements it out of our Lord's own word, which applies in both directions. "We have in ch. xvi. 8, etc., the corresponding opposite point of view, according to which the *glorifying testimony of the Spirit* (only not merely glorifying!) is brought forward in addition to the *historical testimony of the disciples*, even as it regards themselves."

We would now apply our exposition to the use of the preacher, who, according to Matt. xxviii. 20, should refer this text to all Christians, and not permit himself to limit it to the Apostles and first disciples. It must, however, be remarked that there is something in it which applies only to them. Assuredly, the Lord does speak for all futurity of the obligation and impulse of all true disciples to testify of Him in their vocation and sphere—not only those specially set apart, but every man who is His disciple and a professor of His name. He promises to us all the Spirit as One who shall bear witness in and through us all. But the special meaning of ἀπ' ἀρχῆς μετ' ἐμοῦ ἐστε no longer holds

[1] Hence St Paul's Epistles *presuppose* the essential and entire evangelical tradition. He who will not receive St Paul's words, must first give up the Gospels; again, he who does the latter must end in denying the genuineness of St Paul's Epistles.

[2] To this belongs the proemium of St Luke; but also *the testimony of the Spirit to the authentic tradition* down to our own day.

good of us; there can be only an *application* of it corresponding to our own relation. As, according to chap. xiv. 26, the Spirit brings to our remembrance also the words of Jesus heard before, although not immediately from His own lips—similarly do we testify, when the Spirit has come to us, as those who have been with the Master in an *internal* experience and guidance from the first commencement of His teaching. We first livingly experience and receive, through the New Testament Scriptures, the life, deeds, and sayings of our Lord, as eye and ear witnesses of the *second* degree; and in like manner we have added to us the first history of the Church and teaching of the Apostles. Then we also *wait* humbly for power from on high, *so far as* word and Spirit may be regarded in us as yet distinct (which, strictly speaking, is no longer necessary)—and only then, but assuredly then, it is our obligation and right to testify with power and success what *we* have seen and heard in historical conviction and living experience. And here much may be preached against the presumptuous and uncalled, who *think* that they must do and speak much *for* the name of Jesus, before He has rightly taught, and furnished, and sent them. How much confusion and injury has this wrought in the Church! Thou canst not truly and efficiently convince a child of the truth of a word in the catechism without the Spirit; but if the alone witnessing Spirit has come to thee, thou wilt and thou must give thy testimony before all the world. For He who once said, I receive not testimony from men—now makes men His witnesses to the end of the world and to the ends of the earth.

Chap. xvi. Vers. 1, 2. *Ταῦτα* refers here not only to the prediction of the world's hatred, but also to the promise of the witnessing Spirit;—to both in their true connection. The former is paralleled by the latter, as an equivalent, and thus the disciples are defended from making it a stumbling-block to their hurt (see *σκανδαλίζεσθαι*, Matt. xiii. 21, xxiv. 9, 10). The then present disciples, although the Lord had often spoken to them of it, had never yet thought that their future *persecution* would be a great reality, that they must *suffer patiently;* they had always expected a very different kingdom, and a very different might and defence against the evil world than—the Spirit of testimony. Therefore the prediction is now decisively confirmed

—It will be actually so, but ye shall nevertheless continue your testimony: yea, then first shall ye begin rightly to bear witness. The ἀποσυναγώγους ποιεῖν began already in ch. ix. 22, xii. 42; and had been somewhat more darkly pre-intimated in Lu. vi. 22, *When they shall separate you, and cast forth your name as evil.* It shall befall the fruit-bearing branches that they shall—in external appearance, and as the exact reverse of the truth—be as if they were cut off and cast out as withered! And this not only shall the Jews do in the beginning, as their special act is here the foundation of the typical expression; but the members of the true church will be oftentimes cast out of the external church.[1] *And more:* it shall touch their life, as that of the Apostles and first Christians. For although it has been said that excommunication is an evil more sharp to the soul and more difficult to be overcome than all assaults upon the body and the life—yet that is not strictly true, and the Lord does not here so regard it. He who is strong and confident in the truth may suffer that truth to be called a lie without being much aggrieved; but, to our weakness, and our unsinful natural love of life, the death of martyrdom must ever be the crown of patience and endurance. Therefore the Lord advances, not merely heightening the enmity, but pointing out the still greater temptation to apostasy, by a stronger ἀλλά, which has the significance of *imo et, quin imo.* (To be explained by the ellipsis of οὐ μόνον before; Glassius, quandoque significationem βεβαιώσις habet. Comp., *e.g.*, Lu. xii. 7; Acts xix. 2; 1 Cor. iii. 2, iv. 3; 2 Cor. vii. 11; Phil. iii. 8.) So also the ἵνα after ἔρχεται ὥρα, as in ver. 32, equivalent to a ὅτι pointing to the future, not quite the same therefore with ὅτε—see on ch. xii. 23.

Not only, Ye shall be declared unworthy of, and unfit for, the service of God, and be cast out of the fellowship of λατρεύειν τῷ θεῷ—but it will be regarded by the perverted and perverting συναγωγή as itself a λατρεία, to kill you! In this transition, indicated by the ἀλλά, lies the true answer as to the meaning of this expression, which Luther has well caught—Will think that he doeth God a service therein. It has been asked whether

[1] Not to say, Members of the true church, of evangelical bodies professing the name of Christ alone and His salvation, will deny each other the communion

λατρεία (corresponding to the Heb. עֲבֹדָה, as λατρεύειν to עבד) must not be here in specie equivalent to *sacrifice*. The Peschito translated דְקוּרְבָּנָא מְקָרֵב; similarly the Pers. and Arab., Nonn. and Euthym.; and Lampe (although in translating he adopts the *cultum* of Erasm., instead of the too general *obsequium* of the Vulg.) maintains strongly that the προσφέρειν connected with it is decisive for *sacrificium*. And many follow him even now, bringing into comparison Rom. xii. 1; where, however, λατρεία in connection with θυσία, has only the more general idea, a *sacrificial offering*, only in as far as this already passes over into the *service of God*. This *might* be taken as the true meaning of our present passage; the view is very plausible, and, indeed, in this most special sense our Lord's words have sometimes had an actual fulfilment. We may compare περικάθαρμα, 1 Cor. iv. 13, which word the Sept. puts for כֹּפֶר, Prov. xxi. 18 (Aq., Sym., Theodot. ἐξίλασμα); and think of a similar notion as entertained by the heathen from the highest antiquity, and which recurred in the great Christian persecutions; as well as of Rabbinical sayings, which (probably based on Ex. xxxii. 29?) term the slaying of heretics a sacrifice;[1] and of the practice of the Roman Catholic Church.[2] Nevertheless, although this strongest meaning is included, and even intimated in προσφέρειν (inasmuch as all cultus is also a sacrificium), it seems to us too special to stand by itself in its interpretation of πᾶς ὁ ἀποκτείνας. This general word must include more, and refer also to those who, while they do not see in it a sin-offering and means of propitiating God, yet think it a work well-pleasing to God, a λατρεία.

O that unhappy *thinking*, into which the hatred of unbelief may be hardened and blinded, while it seeks to justify itself before God! As the Lord had in ἀποσυναγώγους taken His expression from blinded Israel, so He does still; yet He refers in the expression to the heathens likewise, and even to future Christians. We cannot say with Lampe at once that πᾶς

[1] Jalkut Schimeoni fol. 245, col. 3. num. 772, and Bammidbar rabbah fol. 229, col. 3, כל שופך דמן של רשעים כאילו הקריב קרבן. Comp. on the slaying of Christians generally, Eisenmenger ii. S. 202-217.

[2] Hiller: Ye witnesses of the last time, know ye the city in which the slayer of a heretic has an eternal indulgence?

evidently includes the Gentiles also (for which the Sing. τῷ θεῷ does *not* suit), but the general reference lies still further back. The discourse had been hitherto always concerning the *world* generally, in which expression the disciples would be inclined to think first of the heathen world; but the Lord had instructed them more particularly to include in it all who stood in opposition to God, and even the Jews pre-eminently; and He now concludes most earnestly, *Also* from these who have hated and will slay Me, expect nothing better for yourselves! To which, further, the general thought underlying the whole may be added, And the Holy Ghost will not protect you *against* their hatred by any external power.

Ver. 3 returns to the principle already disclosed in ch. xv. 21. Even the true church should and must *cast out*, for the sake of truth and love; but it belongs to the false synagogue to treat those differing in faith with hatred which reaches unto persecution, and putting to death as λατρεία. The οὐκ ἔγνωσαν appears now, as it has been prepared for by δόξῃ, to have a more general and milder application than the wilful not knowing before mentioned; it is to be found in various degrees, even in the zeal, forgiven by *grace* and turned to its right object, of an unknowing Saul, who nevertheless literally acted according to vers. 1, 2. And, inasmuch as we cannot distinguish these degrees, it becomes us (as Lange says) "to deal very mercifully in our hearts with our enemies unto death"—to mourn over our blind persecutors, and, like Stephen, to continue the Lord's own intercession for those who know not what they do.

Ver. 4. The ἀλλά once more, as in ch. xv. 21, is intended to compose their minds, but with a specific meaning here—*They* know not, but I know all beforehand, and ye also should know what I have said to you concerning it. The ἐγώ before εἶπον has a deep though generally overlooked emphasis, which Beda (see in Lampe) exhibited in all its force. I have told you that ye shall suffer such things—the memoria personæ dicentis is here most impressive. I, who am the Truth, who go before unto death in love to you and the world, who have might enough to defend you, who will compensate your patience, strengthen you in your sufferings by My Spirit, save you from death, and take you to Myself! As long as I was with you

My presence was your defence, hatred made Me its object, the hour of persecutions for you was not yet come. Therefore did I not before *speak* thus unto you, although I *knew* all this from the beginning.

But now come forward the exegetes of all ages and remind us that in the Synoptic gospels the Lord had actually from the beginning said these things—Matt. v. 10–12, x. 21–28, xvi. 24, 25, xxiii. 34, xxiv. 9; Lu. vi. 22, etc. How are we to reconcile with all this the *I said not* of St John? Augustin would obviate all difficulty by referring *these things* to the promise of the *Paraclete*, but that does violence to the whole connection. So much is true in this (and it has been overlooked to the prejudice of a sound interpretation) that this last *ταῦτα*, as well as the first in ver. 1, does include the comforting promise in the whole discourse; but that the fore-announcement of persecution is primarily and chiefly meant is plain from the *ὅταν ἔλθῃ ἡ ὥρα* repeated from ver. 2, as well as from its immediate connection with *ταῦτα ποιήσουσιν*. The latter commentators resolve it in more or less plain terms thus, that the Synoptics did not strictly adhere to chronological exactness, but transposed Christ's later utterances into His earlier discourses;—not without some tokens of imagining, moreover, an *ex eventu*. Lampe dismissed all this with an *absurdissime*. Lücke further adds that "John followed in this his own pragmatism"—that is, that he passes by what the other Evangelists relate, because he has not also related it, and lets his Lord, therefore, thus speak here; but, as it regards the attempts to reconcile St John and the Synoptics, and to show that the Scripture need not be broken, he permits himself to pronounce his decree—"*all in vain!*" We shall find reason to pronounce our decree too, and say with the church of antiquity, *οὐδεμία γραφὴ τῇ ἑτέρᾳ ἐναντία ἐστί.*

Others, as Chrys., have contented themselves with assuming that the Lord had not so perfectly, at least, so strongly and plainly, declared from the beginning what He now says. Bengel: He had spoken of the hatred of the world, but *less openly, and more sparingly*. That there is a general truth in this cannot be denied by any one who compares St John's discourse here with the sayings of the Synoptics. B.-Crusius,

indeed, candidly admits this difference, but does injustice to the earlier sayings, and goes too far when he thinks that these "uttered only possibilities and in quite general terms." O no, they also speak of hating, scorning, casting out, even of slaying, plainly and directly enough. So far Lampe is right, "It is vainly said that Jesus had not so clearly and perspicuously predicted these sufferings. He who looks at the cited passages will find that they are by no means less clear than the passage before us." Admitting this, it is nevertheless true that our Lord might with good reason affirm that He had never hitherto thus uttered what He now says,[1] if we only take His meaning rightly, instead of adhering to the external mention simply of the impending evil. This is the superficial arbitrariness of Lücke, when he briefly dismisses with his "all in vain"—appealing to Bengel's remark, which he should have understood better—the train of thought which led Lampe in the right direction. In effect, the comprehensive substance of the present declaration, that which is new and peculiar in it, is the *caussarum* hujus odii a Judæis perferendi *specialior anatome.*[2] And might not the profound and concise Bengel have meant this by his *aperte?* That the world as world, because it will not know the Father and the Son, cannot do otherwise—where had He said that before? And we seek in vain in the earlier sayings, as Lampe remarks, for the declaration that they would do this *under the guise of religion and piety.* Adding to this that He had formerly spoken hints which were broken off, interposed among other things, or prophecies (as in Matt. x.), which on account of the distance of the time (before the hour was come), remained obscure most assuredly *to the disciples,* while now since ch. xv. 18, He speaks of it *ex instituto* as His farewell utterance—and is not all this of itself enough? But we cannot refrain from adding further, that as ταῦτα λελάληκα ὑμῖν, ver. 4, goes back to ver. 1, while this again depends upon

[1] To lay the emphasis of ἐξ ἀρχῆς thus—not *in* the beginning—as if it was ἐν ἀρχῇ, is not right, partly because *I was with you* embraces the whole of the past, and partly because it had been said in the beginning in the Sermon on the Mount.

[2] Yet we much reject Lampe's supposition, ventured on by *forte*, that ἐξ ἀρχῆς indicates this—ex fundamento seu ex origine.

ch. xv. 26, 27, the prediction of persecution (and this is the truth in Augustin's expedient), derives a new character from its connection with the promise of the Paraclete. Consequently, He had never said *these things* to them before—as so directly not to be misunderstood, as so definitely connected with the thought of doing God service, with such disclosure of the deepest ground of this hatred, and finally, as so closely bound up with the consolatory confirmation of the security of their future testimony through the Holy Ghost (compare the mere note of accord in Matt. x. 20). We may therefore confidently utter our *all to good purpose!* and go so far as to say conversely that we might have presumed a priori, from the characteristics of *the Lord's* method of teaching, that He would not in His wisdom and love have spoken suddenly and abruptly at the end what He now so sternly and rigorously and plainly says, but that He would rather have prepared them for it by some previous intimations. So that even now, at the threshold of the Spirit's illumination, the disciples might already bring to their own mind—Yes, this is that to which He has often pointed our thoughts! See this expressly, ch. xv. 20.

THE COMFORTER OBTAINED BY HIS DEPARTURE WILL CONVINCE THE WORLD, AND GLORIFY JESUS TO HIS DISCIPLES.

(Ch. xvi. 5–15.)

The *μεθ' ὑμῶν ἤμην* is now followed by the proper *farewell*, which the Lord here resumes, repeating what had already been said, deepening and illustrating by new views His former words, and summing them all up with great and mysterious disclosures pointing entirely to the *future*. Berlenb. Bible: "Now comes the main announcement of His *departure*." That is, as we have said before, the most complete and direct indication of all that which should *follow out of and after His going away*, prepared and obtained solely through that. All is primarily concentrated in the *coming of the Comforter*, who, as on the one hand He manifests and consummates the *separation* of the believing from the world, so not the less on the other hand works continually

for the abolition of this distinction. He has therefore a double office and work: first, to convince the world, that many may become obedient to the truth, and make their appeal to the righteousness of God against their sin, and escape the judgment of the devil; but then also to guide the *disciples* (those also thus won) so far into the whole living truth, that Christ shall be glorified before them and in them. This is the substance of the whole down to ver. 15, where once more begins the announcement of His departure and the consolatory declaration of its consequences.

Ver. 5. The common arrangement of the sentence is not to be changed. Kuinoel interposes a stop, and refers the *νῦν δὲ ὑπάγω* to the former clause, *καὶ οὐδείς* beginning a new sentence. "For I was yet with you, but now I go to Him who sent Me. (Then a pause which gives the disciples time, as if expecting something from them.) And yet no one asks Me!"[1] But to what purpose is this? *But now I go My way*, immediately connected with *I was with you*, appears to us flat and meaningless; nor is that feeling removed by the solution, "Hitherto I have not told you this, because I was with you, but now I can and I may not longer be silent." But as a *new beginning* farewell discourse, it obtains a quite different sense—I *go* now (as so often said already)—and ye are only silent and bewildered, instead of asking and seeking, as I would have you do!

I go My way *now actually*, after having said so much concerning it—still more direct and penetrating farewell! To Him who hath sent Me, to the Father,—as ver. 28, ch. xiv. 2, 12, and before to the Jews, ch. vii. 33. That this *ὑπάγειν* here embraces the death, resurrection, and ascension, we have been plainly taught since the beginning of ch. xiv. But here there is specially involved—Thus *My* mission, the office and work to discharge which I came, comes to its end on earth (comp. Tob. xii. 20, the word of the apocryphal angel):—wherefore do ye not *ask* at the last moment in which I stand to teach, and to answer,[2] concerning the proper end and conclusion of My office, concerning the cause and the effect of My departure, lying in

[1] Or, with Hess and others, this last, as a question, and no man asketh Me—?

[2] As long as He is here as teacher, the great matter is to *ask Him!*

the invisible world? For this much ye know and feel, that I, neither in you nor in the world, have completed anything yet! Do ye not confide in Me and in My Father, that it is in My departure that the whole mystery of My manifestation will be solved?—Do ye not desire earnestly to know this, and to understand it to your joy?—The Lord evidently longs, standing before the confounded and silent disciples to whom He had spoken so much, for a word of affectionate response and understanding sympathy. But it must be a word of actual response, of really intelligent sympathy, entering into the spirit of His words. It may at first seem strange that He should ask for only *ποῦ ὑπάγεις;* especially after having just said *πρὸς τὸν πέμψαντά με.* Hence Stark would interpret, Ye ask, and rightly, no longer about the *Ποῦ*, that is, *ye now full well know* that I am going to the Father, *and nevertheless* ye are so sad! But this neither corresponds with the condition of the disciples, nor is it reconcilable with the simple meaning of the *but.* Assuredly the *sorrow* is the reason why they have no spirit nor desire to question; their words, and almost their thoughts failing them. Thus the Lord desires their question, and feels it wanting. But had they not more than once asked before? Hence Grotius took the meaning to be—Ye ask *no longer;* and Klee, They had so eagerly asked before, but now yield all up to sorrow! Lücke even finds, with de Wette, "an indistinctness in the whole statement," since ver. 6 ought to precede *καὶ οὐδείς;* for it should be, Ye are so sorrowful that ye cannot ask even once more; and the Lord's meaning, "Better an unintelligent *ποῦ ὑπάγεις*, than this dumb disconsolateness." But we cannot believe that the Lord would have that first, unintelligent question repeated; and therefore must (with most of the ancients) more worthily explain His always pregnant words. "Those former questions were to Jesus as none,"—so say we with v. Gerlach, and regard Him as desiring a question more truly earnest, more deeply penetrating, with *confidence* and *gladness* responding to His thoughts; comp. ch. xiv. 28. The first question of Peter, ch. xiii. 36, was not the right asking, for it proceeded from unintelligent forwardness—unintelligent, as if the Lord spoke of an earthly journey (as ch. vii. 35)—forwardness, I can and I will go with Thee! (as Matt. viii. 19.) And Thomas' word, ch. xiv. 5, though it was

not, as many think, an oppressed utterance of confusion and ignorance, was yet rather an objection (we do not know!) than a becoming question,—therefore that was not the right. The proper asking now would have been—*Wherefore*, and *for what* goest Thou to the Father? and it is this which we must regard as the undertone of meaning; but in His mournful condescension the Lord expresses it again only by ποῦ—not such an unintelligent one as the former does He desire, but—Ah, if ye would begin again with your ποῦ ὑπάγεις, uttered in earnestness and thoughtfully, in faith and in love! In *this* sense He designedly refers back to that first questioning.

Rambach founds on this text an application to "culpable remissness in investigating Divine truths"—and this is not merely a fruitful homiletic application, but the inmost spirit of the sentence as taken out of its context. There is a curious and forbidden questioning (2 Tim. ii. 23)—as *e.g.*, on this very passage concerning the *local* ποῦ of Christ's departure, the concealed mysteries of His exaltation and glorification. But, apart from this, we should never be too idle or too sorrowful to investigate and inquire from the impulse of faith and love, and with an eager desire of saving knowledge; and the question of all questions must be ever that which touches the *departure of Christ.* The original unfolding of the text which Helferich gives, lies further from its true meaning: "How do we attain the wisdom to adapt ourselves to God's ways, but by asking *God*, *ourselves*, and our *neighbour*—*Whither goest thou?*" Yet this, better than many expositions, hits the point of the ποῦ ὑπάγεις, and the question concealed in it which the Lord would bring out—What in God's counsel, wisdom, and love is the issue for Thee and for us, what is the *scope and end* of Thy departure? Calvin: Expavescitis neque reputatis, quo discedam *aut in quem finem.* See the answer presently afterwards given by our Lord *to this*, in ver. 7.

Ver. 6. The same disciples who afterwards, when the risen Lord ascended to heaven, returned to Jerusalem with great joy, without any sorrow for the separation (Lu. xxiv. 52)—could not rejoice now at the *beginning* of His departure through death (Jno. xiv. 28), but were only *troubled.* Thus had it been since Matt. xvii. 23. Sorrow, the Lord says, hath *filled* your heart

(Grot. obsedit plane, Acts v. 3)—so entirely seized upon them and carried them away that they cannot any further think of the ὑπάγω which amazed them, not even of the ποῦ which is connected with it. Hezel is perhaps too strong, "Just as if My death were a lower *accident*, opposing My designs! as if it were not involved in the great plan of God which I must carry out!" Afterward he is more sound, "Just as if I had confirmed you in false ideas of a Messiah, and My death baffles your calculation!" only that it was not merely the baffling of their expectation which so troubled the disciples' hearts, but at the same time and *still more* the loss of their beloved Master, the disruption of the "precious familiarity" of intercourse with Him.[1] Sorrow in itself as appointed and well founded (vers. 20–22) is not blamed; but the πεπλήρωκεν was too much, as Rieger says, "Sorrow, fear, and the like, may be turned into holy ardour, faith and patience being brought by it to purity; but to let the heart be carried away by such emotions brings only hurt after it." Therefore the Lord would gládly have spared and removed from His beloved disciples that which as ταράσσεσθαι was too much for their hearts through their lack of faith and understanding; therefore it was that He continued so long teaching and comforting them, seeming as if scarce able to cease. And the words which, while they corrected the *sorrow*, stimulated their courage, gained this end that they did not altogether sink under their grief. Here once more He rebukes so graciously as if at the same time excusing their well-known weakness! Lampe: "Under this gentle rebuke there lies a tacit consolation. For, while He charges them with having neglected the question, *Whither goest Thou?* He teaches them that all was before His own mind. While He accuses their negligence, He gives them their own excuse, that it had arisen from excess of sorrow. And this is the emphasis of the particle ἀλλά." The

[1] Not, as Luther, conversely. After he has preached of the "gracious and sweet familiarity of fellowship," and how "sad a thing it was to lose such a Lord," he continues, "But that was all the greater because they had set their hearts on His being a mighty Lord and King, etc. They now lose both the sweet fellowship, and the glorious prospects they had formed, and all their confidence." We think that the disciples had so far advanced that the former was the chief thing with them, even in the other; they had no longer any joy in the thought of a kingdom of God without Jesus.

Berlenb. Bible: "The Lord knoweth our frame, and of what stuff we are made. And of this we can remind Him. Heb. iv. 15."

Ver. 7. As always, so now also I tell you *the truth!* (ch. viii. 46.) Even though it oppose all your knowledge, feeling, will, and desire, believe this time My truth, which I *unasked* will yet more plainly tell you! *It is good for you*, rather your highest advantage, that I—*go away* from you, that I *die!* Significantly first the ἀπελθεῖν before the πορευθῆναι,[1] hence to be strictly explained, That I *go away*—if I *go not away*—but when I have *gone thither*. The grievous "*away* from *us*" had stood before and darkened to the disciples the gracious promise of "*hence* to the Father:" this was the veil over their hearts, for they certainly (according to the protest of ch. xiv. 28, here also to be thought of) had considered themselves rather than Him. They took it for granted, without much thought upon it, that *to Him*, the pure and holy, death would be no suffering or ruin,—but *their* irreparable loss, the impending presence of which filled their souls! In precise opposition to these views the Lord points in silent contrast to the fact that *to Him* the departure to the Father through the death of a sinner for sins' sake would indeed be very bitter (ch. xii. 27)—but all the more does He turn it into a συμφέρει ὑμῖν. Thus does the love speak which does not look at its own. But the misunderstanding which, through lack of experience, knows not how much more we receive from fellowship with Jesus in the Spirit than we could receive from His visible presence in itself, confuses itself even to this day with the thought and the wish—Ah that He were with us now, as then! "It might be thought"—so pursues Storr—"that if Jesus Himself had remained with His disciples, they would have needed no other Helper in His place; and though thus the *loss* of His visible presence was to be compensated by the assistance of an invisible Spirit, it was at least no gain or advantage to them that Jesus had gone from them." But the "abiding ever" of the Messiah (ch. xii. 34) would have done *nothing* for them; that would not have accomplished redemption, or *compensated for* the obtaining and sending of the

[1] The two critical points in the ὑπάγειν, see already ch. xiv. 23.

Holy Ghost. The primary thought which, in the analogy of human relations generally, finds here its grandest application, is that which we have already made prominent—that only after the withdrawal of the sensible presence of a teacher and master his abiding and influential spirit is truly set free and penetrates our being. But there is something quite different here, there is, over and above, the *obtaining* and the *sending* of the Spirit in a sense for which human relations furnish no analogy.

The first obvious thought was made prominent by Augustin: Si carni carnaliter hæseritis, *capaces* spiritus *non* eritis. Dräseke enters well into this: "The old Messiah in the flesh is with them, *therefore* the new Comforter, the Spirit, is far from them. What hindered their being comforted? Jesus Himself, who, comforting, stood before them, was the hindrance! As long as He, this Messiah, bearing all the prophetic marks upon Him, stood before them in person, this His person continued to be a foundation and prop to that system of vanities which bewitched their heads and hearts. The Form must pass away from their eyes, before the Spirit could enter their souls. It was good for them that Jesus should go away. Before He went away, the Christ after the flesh, the Christ after the Spirit could not come. When the former vanished, the latter appeared." But when we have firmly established the truth of this, a truth which the Apostle who had not been with Him from the beginning pointed out, 2 Cor. v. 16, we must show the error and perversion of going no further, and of deducing from this disappearance of Jesus according to the flesh the consequence of the manifestation of Christ according to the Spirit, *in such a manner* as Dräseke does in this last sentence. He carries that error to its last point, when he continues, "We must not, moreover, understand this as if the Son of man had not *power* on earth already to *send* them the Spirit. (What! send from the earth?) Had not all the words which He spake to them been spirit and life?[1] But *they* had not the *capacity* to receive the Spirit, on account of the Christ in the flesh who was among them as an earthly person." O no, that was not all! Although all pædagogic preparation of our susceptibility up to the day of Pentecost

[1] See on this false exposition our exposition on ch. vi.

from the Old Testament, holds good and belongs to the question; and although even for this was necessary, as previously the manifestation, life, teaching, and acts of Christ in the flesh, so afterward His removal in order that through His cross those who believe in Him should die to all carnal hopes of a Messiah —yet here the question is of much more than *our* susceptibility, it is also of the *justice of God* in atonement, and of the glorification of the *Son of man in Himself*, before which He by no means had *the power* to send the Spirit. (Ch. vii. 38, 39; Acts ii. 33.) To pass over and leave out *this* mystery of the *ὑπάγειν πρὸς τὸν πατέρα, here* in ver. 7 (as afterwards again, ver. 10), where it is properly essential, is an exegetical sin of which alas too many are guilty. O no! although everything, the coming, living, teaching of the Lord, was *expedient for us* as preparatory for our redemption, this was fully accomplished only by means of His departure to the Father *through death* (which is never to be lost sight of in that departing!)—and this too has its reason much deeper than in a salutary withdrawal of His visible form. The great consequence, which is so strongly maintained by the negation *ἐὰν γὰρ μὴ—οὐκ ἐλεύσεται*, has its ground not merely in *πρὸς ὑμᾶς*, but in the consummation of His mediating Person, in all pertaining to it that is atoning and redeeming. (Heb. ii. 9, 10, 14, 15.) And this comes out still more definitely if we read, as we have good reason to do, Lachmann's significant *ἐγώ* a third time,—*ἐὰν γὰρ ἐγὼ μὴ ἀπέλθω*. "The blessing of the Spirit was the counterpart of taking away the curse" —is the Berl. Bible's concise remark, according to Gal. iii. 13, 14. But as that which was once for all accomplished in Christ for the world, only by degrees is appropriated and perfected in His disciples, so that first crucifixion of the disciples with Him, that sorrow out of which the joy of the new man was to be born, is also the progressive way for us all to a more intimate and perfect internal coming of the Spirit; and thus in all further fellowship with the sufferings of Christ, which might seem to us to be His going away from us, the Comforter repeats to us this prototypic word of consolation—*It is expedient for you!*

I will *send* unto you the Holy Ghost—is the Lord's constant word. But "Jesus never tells *how* it will be in His sending of the Spirit, and that makes our learned worldly wise very unbe-

lieving; they devise all manner of methods, but cannot get the right." (Oetinger.) Therefore they imagine a Spirit *abiding* in the words, who was already upon earth though he could not before penetrate, instead of *coming* from heaven sent from the Father: and thus they contradict all Scripture and experience. The blessed disciples themselves are the clearest evidence of what degree of the influence of God's Spirit they had actually within themselves, as Israel might possess it up to this time—and how far the essential *Paraclete*, whose revelation bore the same relation to all former רוּחַ אֱלֹהִים as the incarnation of Christ bore to all former appearances and energies of the angel of the covenant, was yet *to come*. From the time of Gen. vi. 3 the Spirit (who is indeed and worketh everywhere) had been and had been working in the world; Israel especially possessed Him, partly in the greater number of believers in Him as a Spirit of righteousness, that is, also of truth,—as the πνεῦμα δουλείας; and partly, in the anticipating hommes de désir (as St Martin says, comp. אִישׁ חֲמֻדוֹת, Dan. x. 11),—as the πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ προμαρτυρόμενον (1 Pet. i. 11). All things proceed in mankind and in Christendom with similar preparations, but the consummating day of Pentecost now as in the time of the first disciples comes only to those who receive a preached Gospel in faith *through the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven.* (1 Pet. i. 12.)

Ver. 8. I will send Him *unto you*, the Lord had said, and yet He now speaks of the *world*, which He was to convince. Quite obviously—*through* you and your then resulting testimony; hence with καὶ ἐλθών we must once more connect πρὸς ὑμᾶς—When He has come to you and into you, then will He do this! "The Apostles were to convince the unbelieving and hating world, maintain their right against it and conquer it by the truth they testified—what a task was this! The first link of connection then is, The Holy Ghost would defend them against the hatred of the world, in their behalf He would chastise and rebuke the persecutors and *convince them that His professors are right.*" (Oetinger.) In this discourse, however,—the following words of which, simple as they are profound, furnish a special testing problem for all fundamental exposition,—the thoughts proceed from this point of departure far away into the fulness of

that comprehensive view, backward, forward, and inward, out of which the Lord spoke them.

Here we have the other aspect of ch. xiv. 17 opened to us, and that previous utterance is essentially restricted. The same world which cannot receive the Spirit because it seeth Him not nor knoweth Him, must nevertheless become conscious that He is working upon it, speaking to it, and chiefly—*testifying against it!* Thus the world's unsusceptibility for the truth was not to be understood as absolute or unchangeably fixed; thus the same Spirit of the truth, through whose coming as its first effect the distinction between the world and the disciples, between believers and unbelievers, is evidenced and stamped, works nevertheless continually in order to the abolition of this distinction. For, His coming and working is the last stage of the Divine economy of grace before the day of judgment, Acts ii. 20, comp. Joel ii. 5. In His dispensation there is salvation for many whom the Lord will call. The last, most effectual, most inwardly penetrating, *calling* to salvation, the final and full separation from the world, begins—and that not otherwise than as the call of Christ, like that of all the prophets, to repent! Where through the rejection of Christ the last degree of unpardonable guilt, of incurable sin, of irremovable hardening has been reached; and that which was spoken of in ch. xv. 22–25 is accomplished in its full meaning (though this, as the sequel shows, is far from the case with all)—then there remains no more than the testimony to sin, and the prediction of judgment. For the day of the Holy Ghost (the third after the economy of the Father and the Son, as the type in Ex. xix. 10, 11 intimates) is at the same time the figurative representation of (ἀντίτυπος) and the preparation for the last day. When now the superaboundingly merciful testimony of the Spirit against the sin of Israel and the Gentiles in its first consummate exhibition comes with its fiery tokens and inward burning, and not yet the fire of final wrath—this is the *beginning* of that judgment of the nations unto peace of which Isa. ii. 3, 4 prophesies as the end to be accomplished among the heathen, and Jer. iv. 3, 4 as the typical beginning and end of the whole destiny of Israel. The sentiment, so often misunderstood and perverted, that the world's history is the world's judgment, has

its truth in this working and judging of the Spirit, this final preparation for the judgment to be revealed, which again must tarry for its consummation until that personal appearance of the Son to which the Spirit points the church. What the Holy Ghost finds now upon *earth*, of faith or unbelief, He by no means leaves as it is, but works upon it now first effectually, seizing it in its crisis, in order that the faith may be perfected in the knowledge and in the life—or if that cannot be, may be brought to confusion; in order that that unbelief by the final contempt of the Spirit may become ripe for doom—or be overcome unto repentance and obedience. The great end of this never-failing influence, which brings forward the final judgment into the process of the world's history, through the perfecting of sin or righteousness—the final conviction of both, in fact, is clearly expressed at the close of Scripture, in that book which must be regarded as beyond all others the book of the calling, attracting, and judging *Spirit* before the end comes. (Rev. xxii. 11, 12.) These hints of the *scriptural system*, which is truly the already disclosed system of the Divine government of the world, will teach us more deeply than is usual to understand how appropriately and fully the ἐλέγξει of this passage belongs in all aspects to the coming of the Spirit. This typically or preparatorily reproving conviction or over-testimony of the Holy Ghost, which actually already condemns and yet absolves all who submit to *this* condemnation, is the necessary and final expression of spiritual judgment. The ἐλέγχειν is not the same with μαρτυρεῖν, ch. xv. 26; for the testimony is of what is good and true (concentred in περὶ ἐμοῦ), but the reproof is against the evil and the false, through the revelation of sin, and the taking away of *false* righteousness. But it must not be overlooked that even this ἐλέγχειν does no more than complete and carry out that μαρτυρεῖν,[1] that the Spirit is still the last gift of grace to the world, *in order that* the world, or every man in the world who will, may be saved. He who penitently confesses, I am guilty! is also to be acquitted. For the Spirit convinces not merely of *sin* and of *judgment*, as *we* might have expected it to be said—these two essentially belonging one to the other, with nothing else between them—but previously, in the centre of His exhibition,

[1] In the deepest sense of the prophetic word cited in Matt. xii. 20.

of the *righteousness* of Christ which the hitherto unbeliever may at once and shall appropriate when he believes. Brückner and de Wette deny this double aspect of the testimony, the second influence leading to faith; but he who livingly and practically enters into the text cannot give it up. Even Schleiermacher hits the point rightly: "The reproof, that is, the bringing to view of our own unrighteousness, could not be without a gracious revelation and offer of the true righteousness; even the judgment is exhibited before the world only *in order where possible to turn its thought to Him* who frees all who believe from condemnation."[1] Lange does not go too far: "This condemning administration of the Spirit among men establishes a boundless extension of saving grace throughout the world, more glorious than the Jewish limitation of the disciples could then grasp: hence the Lord presently adds, I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now."

Thus *not merely* as defensor caussæ[2] for Christ and His people, who are such that they may be able to reprove all others, does the Holy Spirit so convincingly testify; but in order to convert, absolve, and comfort every man who submits to His reproof—see 2 Tim. ii. 25, 26. The reproving office necessarily precedes the comforting. The Paraclete does not, properly speaking, perform "a strange work, before He comes to *His own* work, that of comforting and preaching grace" (as Luther says)—but the ἐλέγχειν also, before as in the μαρτυρεῖν, belongs in its final and full meaning to Him alone. In a certain sense it is assuredly true that "whatsoever reproves sin is and belongs to the law"—but inasmuch as by the Spirit, through the glorified Son, God now first properly speaks from heaven, from the upper *Zion* of redemption, the word of the Spirit is really the perfected law, the Sinaitic law only the type and preparation for this (Heb. xii. 18–25). And it is narrow and incorrect to say, that "the Holy Ghost rebukes *through the law*, making all sin which is not *faith*"—for the law is in no sense of faith, as Gal. iii. 12 profoundly and with fulness of meaning says; while of *faith* speaks also, and that in way of

[1] Homil. über Joh. ii. 518.

[2] Whose office is ἐλέγχειν τοὺς ἀντιλέγοντας, Tit. i. 9, as Grotius here says.

conviction, *only* the Gospel. We shall rather see that the reproof of the Spirit brings something new and different in addition to the first, narrowly so-called, law; that *His* witness of sin has only to be received and rightly *understood* in order itself to appear no other than a testimony for the righteousness of grace to faith, and as such a spiritual comforting.

In the three great words ἁμαρτία, δικαιοσύνη, κρίσις the Lord names the three all-embracing essential elements of truth and its whole procedure.[1] The world has no perfect and correct knowledge of what *sin* is, what *righteousness*, what *judgment*, until the Holy Ghost has explained these words. It does, indeed, pride itself, holding up its πρόφασις, in its first superficial knowledge of them (for where is the man who has not some knowledge of these three great facts?)—but inasmuch as it tarries there, *it perverts the beginning of truth into a contradiction to its end*, into delusion and lie. No man can be brought to an experimental and perfect knowledge of these three words, so current in the world, and present to every conscience,[2] by any human power or human wisdom, not even by the external influence of any letter of the *word*, or any fact of the *work*, even though it be of Christ and His Apostles, or the undeniable acts and wonders of the Lord since the day of Pentecost. This is the office of the *Spirit* alone, and that *as* Spirit, by the mediation indeed of the word and the work, yet only so far as these are made *inwardly* efficient in the heart and conscience. Hence, they are wrong, and go not below the surface, who here assert and show how the Spirit convinced and overcame the world, Israel to wit, by certain *external events*.[3] O no, the

[1] Bahrdt, after his fashion, here remarked, "will convince the world of the three greatest errors which have ruined human hopes."

[2] So that the Holy Ghost finds everywhere a foundation for His influence, but only such as He must rearrange. Luthardt's notion that the absence of the articles presents the three points as not definite but general well-known truths, is inappropriate and over-minute literality. It is not the substance of the conviction that "*there is* sin, righteousness, and judgment," for we may reasonably ask—Did the world know nothing of these before? Rather, *What* is essentially sin, that is, the true sin, etc.

[3] Orthodox and heterodox writers are daily giving illustrations of this view. Most strangely says J. v. Müller, quite forgetting the complement of the internal history:—"Convinced of the sin of unbelief by the down-

ἐλέγξει reaches on to the end of time, as long and as far as there will be a κόσμος; using the instrumentality both of a continuous testimony of word, and an ever new exhibition of facts, but exerting His convincing influence only through an inward speaking, and an internal testimony.

Est autem vis non *coactiva* sed *convictiva*—says Lampe at first, in the right way to discern in this ἐλέγχειν the domain committed to human will; and he even goes on, Non agit tanquam cum stipite, sed tanquam cum creaturâ rationali, *persuadendo*. Yes truly, if the Holy Ghost does thus deal with men, His last *gratia* must be as well *resistibilis* as *irresistibilis*. So far irresistible as that all must in the end, whether they will or not, be *convinced* of the truth of God; but *it remains with themselves* whether they submit and obey, turn to the truth from the lie, in order that they may be saved—or not. When Lampe further ventures to write as follows concerning the difference between obeying and refusing, he sets the predestinarian dogma in its most pernicious and fearful light:—The cause of this difference is *not* in men, but *in the operation itself of the Spirit*, which, acting according to the eternal decree of God, works *with less evidence and efficacy in the reprobate* than in the elect! Where is there a syllable of this minor evidentia et efficacia in this ἐλέγχει for all the world alike? Thus does a foregone conclusion in theology pervert the eternal words which might rectify its error.

In the following words the Lord Himself expounds what He meant by these three great *objects* of conviction; and we hope that the way has been paved by our intimations for the most universal and profound sense of the whole, so that this evolution of His meaning may be otherwise understood than superficial exposition too frequently exhibits it. Much more is here declared than what George Müller,[1] for example, says: "He will convince the world by the Apostles that their unbelief in Jesus is sin, that He was righteous, and that He would be victorious over His enemies." Or B.-Crusius: "The *result* of the influence

fall of their city, of the righteousness or innocence of Christ by His resurrection, of the judgment of the world-prince by—the actual undeniable planting of the faith!"

[1] Vom Glauben der Christen, ii. 143.

of the Spirit will be *reproving* for the world, *exalting* as to Christ, and *mighty* in its cause."[1]

Ver. 9. The thrice repeated ὅτι, on which we must pause a while, has been often translated by *because;* and this does not in many respects alter the sense, but it does not exhaust it, as we shall see. B.-Crusius is here right in insisting (with August., Chrys., Luther) that ὅτι (concerning this, that—as ch. ix. 17) defines in all three instances the *matter of the testimony.*[2] This alone harmonises with the connection, since the Lord cannot possibly presuppose them already to understand the mysterious περὶ ἁμαρτίας of ver. 8; and therefore He enters upon the individual points not as *giving the deep reason*, but obviously as *explaining* what He meant. Still more plainly: The ὅτι gives us the *thing signified* in ἁμαρτία, δικαιοσύνη, κρίσις, tells us *what kind* of sin, righteousness, and decision of judgment He means.

Thus the Lord means first specifically the sin of *unbelief*, as in ch. xv. 22, 24, x. 41. This is no more here than in ch. viii. 46 a mere error; but it is the foundation and crown, the fruit and kernel, the true essential substance of all *sin* of the evil will. As Jesus Himself had not rebuked their trespass against the commandments, which was the work of Moses and the prophets before Him, but their not believing in Himself, so also the Holy Spirit His Representative continues and consummates the same charge. He confirmingly, and if necessary awakingly, connects His testimony with that already existing in the *law* and in *conscience* both for Jews and Gentiles against sin—but He nevertheless reproves now in quite another sense. If the ὅτι is *explanatory*, the view must be incorrect which Lampe

[1] Further: Properly speaking there is but one thought, The triumph of His cause—but the words take a threefold division probably with allusion to the *three witnesses* in judicial matters!—Not much better than the tria caussarum genera of Grotius: publica judicia de criminibus, περὶ ἁμαρτίας—privata ex æquo et bono, δικαιοσύνη—privata certam ex lege formulam habentia, κρίσις.

[2] Luthardt is once more over subtle. The ὅτι means not "concerning this, that," but "on the ground of whom"—on My account,—if he only understands this aright! The "*object* of the testimony" is already mentioned before—on My account! But the ὅτι brings first in addition the explanation how this object, thus mentioned, is here intended. And does not this at last come to the same thing?

adopts, according to which ἁμαρτία in ver. 8 means not this or that sin, but the general condition of sin and guilt, while ver. 9 brings forward the specific sin of unbelief—as an *example*, one standing for a thousand. It is amazing how mechanically men sincere and scripturally learned can sometimes deal with the profoundest words of Scripture! Was it then needful that the Spirit should now first come into the world, to rebuke *sin generally?* Could the Lord have so signified in ver. 8 itself! But in the fullest sense, by a conviction now first thoroughly *penetrating*, He will assuredly reprove *all* sin, He will, that is, grasp it in its *root*, and bring that to light in its *fruit*. The Spirit of Christ according to the economy of the law takes up the work where it was found before the law since Gen. vi. 3; He begins, as it were, with the world from the beginning again, but now first seizes sin in its inmost depth and principle, after it had entirely disclosed itself through the rejection of the Son of God made flesh. Of all *human* sin the original *root*, the fall of Adam and Eve not excluded,[1] was no other than unbelief in God. (1 Pet. iii. 20; Heb. iii. 19.) And so in the continuance, increase, and out-growth of sin, this again becomes in strengthened vigour its *consequence* and *fruit*. We may say with truth in respect to their reciprocal influence that—Thou sinnest generally and continually because thou hast not believed the first truth of God; and, thou believest not His last truth because thou hast persisted and wilt persist in sinning. The crown of unfolded sin, that in which *its principle must be disclosed, hatred of God*, is now, as was prototypically shown in Israel, and is ever being exhibited anew in the world and in Christendom, specifically unbelief *in Christ*. That is in a penultimate stage, in which the sin thus convicted of may and must yet stumble at the grace of the risen Saviour; the last stage enters in as wilful blasphemous rejection of the Holy Ghost. It is most certain, however boldly the world contradicts it, and a truth which should constantly be pressed upon its reflection, that its unbelief is a matter of perverse will, the consequence of such wicked resistance of will as refuses to let sin be taken away by the Lamb of God. Let the Elberfeld *Zeitung* (tanquam unum ex mille!) declare the truth of the

[1] It may not be said of the *devils* that they did not believe, Jas. ii. 19.

favourite lie to be demonstrated—"faith is not a matter of will, its absence not morally imputed therefore, and by no means decisive for judgment;" but Richter's Hausbibel states a truth which must be firmly held fast, "The Holy Ghost reproves the world of *lying* when it pretends that its unbelief is *honest doubt*, etc." This, however, well understood: in its primary manifestation unbelief may consist in this, though never altogether and alone; this may so mingle with it as partially to be its excuse; but *when* the Holy Ghost, more deeply penetrating, *testifies of Christ*, then can He at once *reprove* unbelief as sin which is deliberately retained. As it is, each passes over into the other, and both *reciprocally* presuppose each other.

And it is to be understood that on account of the ἁμαρτία of unbelief *all previous* sin and transgression, hitherto condemned by the law and by grace placed under the πάρεσις, Rom. iii. 25, abides on the guilty head: all is comprehended in this unbelief, and now first is gathered into one. (Hence chap. viii. 24, ἐν ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις.) The world goes on in sin *because* it believeth not—that is presupposed; the meaning of the word, however, calls therefore *that* its abiding sin κατ' ἐξοχήν, the sin which retains the guilt of all others, *that* it doth not believe. So, further, it is plain (as preparatory to the second clause) that all denying and concealing sin in those who have no faith in Christ is no other than delusion and mockery of a wilful sort; all supposed righteousness is turned to sin, and as such reproved while unbelief remains. There are many, indeed, who even think they *believe*, and persecute on that supposition; but where sin remains, it is *evidence* of unbelief in the heart, and the ἔλεγχος of the Spirit passes from reproof of sin generally to reproof of the unbelief in which it abides. Mark, mark diligently that the Spirit does not *create* and *give*, unconditionally and without the decision of men, faith in its first original; but He *demands* it, and rebukes unbelief as sin! But in this rebuke, when it is rightly understood and accepted, there is an inexhaustible consolation; absolution being offered in the very terms of the condemnation. *He who* believeth in Him is not condemned, hath no longer sin; therefore thus *believe*, if thou still canst and wilt, and thou art at once helped in doing so. The reproof of unbelief is at once a *proffer of faith* (Acts xvii. 31)—an offer

of all strength and grace requisite in order to it.[1] This Christ is thy *righteousness*, Satan's power and right in thee is done away through Him.[2]

Ver. 10. We have now fundamentally to refute the favourite notion of the Rationalists,—not theirs alone, but adopted by orthodox expositors of older and more recent times—according to which the Lord means *nothing else* and nothing beyond this, that the Holy Ghost would convince the world of *His own* righteousness and that of His cause, that He had been rejected as innocent and righteous, and thus those who believe in Him had a righteous cause[3]—with whatever else has been added to this view. Thus understood, the resurrection and ascension indicated in the following ὑπάγω would give the ground of evidence —thus the ὅτι would not be *declarative*, as we before received it. Grotius somewhat modifies this, making δικαιοσύνη stand absolutely, being to be completed by θεοῦ, thus: The Spirit will show that *God* is a just ruler, as having received Me, beyond all invasion of injury (this is what He meant, ye shall not see Me, as above ch. vii. 36) into the fellowship of His majesty." Hezel thought that "the going to the Father must be the δικαιοσύνη itself," thus, id quod justum est; and "the Spirit should convince of this, that *thus it was* fit, it must be so that I should go to the Father through death"—that is, in opposition to their false notions, the true Messiah must actually die! Most of that class of expositors, however, held simply to the conviction of the Lord's own righteousness and innocence. What shall we say to this? First of all, we recognise the truth which is in the error, and admit that in St John's phraseology we are not to understand δικαιοσύνη, as in St Paul's, to mean a righteousness

[1] This last must ever be the initiative of God, and of His working—thus my critic Münchmeyer consoles himself concerning my Semi-pelagianism! But God's influence *works* faith only in those *who believe*. 1 Thess. ii. 13 and 2 Thess. iii. 3 lays the guilt of not believing on unreasonable and wicked men alone.

[2] Let the supremely superficial and foolish words of Grotius be set against this exposition. "The sin of the unbelieving Jews will be revealed —by what? When all things shall happen which I have spoken concerning the Spirit to be sent (did the Jews know then all this?)—it will appear that I am a Prophet, according to the test of Deut. xviii. 22."

[3] Augustin: arguitur mundus de justitiâ eorum qui credunt. But he did not make this the only meaning.

to be imputed, a justification; rather that *primarily* the words refer to the δικαιοσύνη Χριστοῦ. We admit that the added clauses with ὅτι define the genitives thus: ἁμαρτία τοῦ κόσμου (that *they* do not believe)—δικαιοσύνη scil. ἐμοῦ (that *I* go to the Father)—and so κρίσις τοῦ ἄρχοντος τοῦ κόσμου τούτου. But the full and perfect sense, wherefore and to what end *the world* must be convinced both of Christ's righteousness and Satan's judgment, after the conviction of its sin, is by no means exhausted, indeed scarcely touched by this. We have equal, nay greater right to supply, for the application to the world which the Holy Spirit was to effect in the conviction of these three great principles, τοῦ κόσμου in all three cases. For if their sin is shown to the world, was not the Spirit of grace to show and to offer *to them* a righteousness also; was He to leave them or cast them at once, separated from the righteous Christ, into the condemnation of Satan? Thus, although the most important authorities among the ancients hold to the idea that the righteousness of Christ alone must be thought of in the second clause,[1] and similarly among the moderns, Beza, Bengel, Morus, Tittmann, Olshausen, Tholuck, and Lücke, we cannot possibly content ourselves with this, but find in the *righteousness of Christ* only the *foundation* for the *offer and exhibition* of this righteousness to every man who *believeth.* Klee says rightly, though without establishing his point clearly, "that He is the Righteous per eminentiam, the Holy One of God, *and* the Sanctification and Justification of the world." And Roos expresses the transition passably well, "How righteous must He be who will go to the Father from the cross and the grave! Thus will the Holy Ghost convince the world that I am a Righteous man, and truly *Righteousness for man.* Thus He who would cast about for a righteousness which should be valid before God must—believe in Me!" There is provided for the world after all an absolution from their sin, and Christ has gone to the Father, *not* indeed to condemn the world, but—the prince of this world.[2] Does not

[1] Chrys., Theophyl., Euthym. The last: "The mark of His righteousness that He went to the Father to be with Him for ever"—which Tholuck accepts, and compares 1 Tim. iii. 16, *was justified in the Spirit.*

[2] So Lange, only that he incorrectly took *righteousness* at once for justification.

this clearly lie in the connection with what follows? Otherwise there must result from the middle clause—the Christ whom your unbelief has crucified is Righteous—necessarily nothing but condemnation for the world.[1]

But now let us show the connection with the *first* clause, in order to justify this view. The *sinner* who holds fast and consummates his sin through unbelief in a Redeemer, *either* gives it all up and troubles himself not about being made *righteous*,—or, what in the most obvious sense and its most general fulfilment in the case of the Jews was the predominant fact, he imagines for himself a false *righteousness of his own.* Against *both* must the Spirit of truth bear witness; and for this we cannot enough ponder that in the second clause also, ἐλέγξει τὸν κόσμον is the foundation of περὶ δικαιοσύνης. *We* should, in the spirit of the world, and without the great solution of the Spirit, quite otherwise expound the two correlative words *sin* and *righteousness.* We should understand by sin only the transgression of the law, and solve the righteousness to our thoughts in one of these two ways: either that God alone and His Holy One is righteous, we sinners against Him therefore all the more surely condemned; or, bring forward something of our own righteousness and virtue. Between both lies the wonderful and new testimony of the Spirit in the midst. Δικαιοσύνη must assuredly —this we should hold fast, and make it our starting-point—in *application to the world* be the *opposite of* ἁμαρτία. In so far, again—let this be added, deduced as a consequence for the connection and transition—in so far as already in ver. 9 the casting down of false righteousness, which is nothing but sin in a state of unbelief, was prepared for and included, ver. 10 must attach itself *to this*, if an organic progress of thought is to be found. Thus, fully stated, "The Holy Ghost convinces the world of righteousness: partly, that it *must necessarily have* a righteousness; partly, that it cannot find that righteousness in itself; partly, that it should seek such a righteousness in another, that is, *in Christ.*" So, out of the depths of practical Scripture un-

[1] A sermon of Harless (Sonntagsweihe iii. Band), gives a strange and original interpretation of ver. 10: "The righteousness of the apparent abandonment of the world by Christ"—but we enter not into this side-thought, which is out of the track of exegesis.

derstanding and use, does G. K. Rieger expound—and is he not exegetically correct? We would add to his expression, in order to vindicate it, Since the Holy Spirit has convicted the world of sin, so long as it believes not in Christ, *He has already* brought to nought all *its* "righteousness;"[1] thus the first two thoughts of Rieger lie already in this presupposition, and when *against that righteousness* the righteousness *of Christ* is witnessed, can that be otherwise intended than with the meaning *that this is and will be the only righteousness of those who believe?* As v. Gerlach urges against the modern expositors: "He convinces the world that there is a righteousness revealed in Christ, a righteousness which justifies and sanctifies the sinner."

As in the ἐλέγχος of the Holy Ghost there could not be wanting the conviction that there is *no other* righteousness than that of God in Christ, *of Christ before God*,—for the most perverse and foulest lie of sin, the true cause of the most self-relying unbelief is no other than the delusion of self-righteousness—even so could not be wanting the *offer* of the righteousness of Christ to faith, which immediately follows the exhibition of sin on the day of Pentecost (Acts ii. 38), and throughout the apostolical preaching. Or can we think that here, where He nevertheless designs perfectly to describe the Spirit's preaching to the world, He would keep silence *on this?* Thus the exposition which we have rejected leaves here a melancholy gap, leaves a sinful world and the righteous Christ totally sundered from each other; although in fact the Spirit everywhere offers and holds up Christ to the world—*for righteousness.*[2]

And we maintain with perfect confidence that the explanatory ὅτι accords with this alone. Lücke says, "Then it must follow as the ground of explanation that Jesus gave His life for the salvation of the world, but this does *not* lie in ὅτι ὑπάγω." We assert that it does assuredly lie in it; for this ὑπάγειν embraces, and it is sad that any should deny it, the *death* of Christ; in ver. 7 previously this ὑπάγειν was used of a ministering, obtaining, *redeeming*, departure, *consequently* not

[1] C. H. Rieger: "Even the most reasonable thoughts which an honourable world had ever had about righteousness are declared by the Spirit of God to be insufficient."

[2] See Acts iii. 20, and my Exposition in the Reden der Apostel.

otherwise now in ver. 10. Christ goeth to the Father *for us*, as our Representative and High Priest: see the thought of our text clearly expressed in Heb. ix. 24. Further, that which is added concerning the *not seeing* must refer, in order to its find ing an appropriate meaning here, to *faith* in the Invisible; and thus places the righteousness of Christ *to be laid hold of* in faith in opposition to the sin of unbelief. Bengel has explained why the θεωρεῖτε, addressing the disciples, is used: Nor without reason is the word in the second person; for if any might see Jesus, the Apostles might: yet even they must *believe*, and *call all others to believe.*

All this sufficiently refutes what has been said against the *reformed* interpretation of a righteousness of Christ offered to faith. It is remarkable as justifying this exposition that (after its preparation was found in Cyril and Augustine) the *Reformers* first (Erasmus with them in this) brought to clear light the true meaning of this word of our Lord. It is in fact the only practical exposition, it is constantly forcing itself upon all preachers who base their preaching upon an experimental knowledge of the Scripture, and upon all its practical expositors. It alone accords with the actual witness of the Holy Ghost from the day of Pentecost to our own day. For we "must know no other righteousness, with which we can stand before God—than *this going of Christ to the Father*, which is no other than that He hath taken our sin upon His own back, and for the sake of it hath suffered the death of the cross, been buried, and descended into hell, not remaining however under the power of sin and death and hell, but *passing through them all* in His resurrection and ascension." (Luther.) Thus does He who is exalted give to Israel repentance and remission of sins (Acts v. 31), and *in this Man* every man who believeth is and will be justified. (Acts xiii. 39.) *That* is a righteousness *of God* according to Rom. iii. 26, sent down from heaven and valid in heaven. The test-word and motto of the Reformation —יְהוָה צִדְקֵנוּ or the Lord our Righteousness—may be misunderstood and perverted, but it is and must ever be the *centre* of all preaching of the Holy Ghost to the sinful and self-justifying world; and *this* is here in its necessary place declared beforehand by Christ Himself.

Ver. 11. Even the Holy Ghost (who was to do away with all accommodations, and strip off all Jewish embellishments of the truth), does not put an end to the teaching concerning a *Devil*, but rather begins it anew; a fundamental article of saving truth must be contained in this, without which we cannot perfectly understand what *sin* and what *righteousness* are, and especially what the *redemption* which creates righteousness for sinners is. He who knoweth Jesus, and contemplates the unbelief of the world, will find through the illumination of the Spirit the solution of the mystery only in what is stated in 2 Cor. iv. 4.—But how here the *judgment* upon the prince of this world (ch. xii. 31) is connected with the whole as forming the conclusion, is, after all that we said, not hard to explain. The great cause is lost by the enemy of God, the author of all sin and unrighteousness, the blinder of men's minds into unbelief of a Saviour; and it is *won for the world*, in which he has no longer either power or right. In this judgment "the victory of righteousness over sin is complete." (v. Gerlach.) It is—"a judgment, *through which the cause of our salvation, if our will only consents, is decided.*" To testify this to the world is the crown and end of the Holy Spirit's preaching; in which His conviction is either admitted for consolation and strength, or in the other case must change into an announcement of condemnation. The reproving exhibition in itself encourages, if it is truly heard; but the most gracious and inviting preaching of the Gospel, *if* unbelief opposes it, is turned into the keenest severity of punishment.

The *future* judgment to which the world is proceeding under the deciding testimony of the Spirit, has its ground in the judgment which has been already *accomplished* through the departure of Jesus, and which is *held up as future* by the Holy Ghost. On account of the atonement there is no more a hell for man: only the heaven of Jesus for those who believe in Him unto righteousness, or the hell of the devil for all who will continue *the world.* The Spirit's ἔλεγχος effects the separation in such wise that men of three sorts must be made manifest on both sides. Among those who accept it, the *penitent* who confess their *sin*, the *believing* who are justified in Christ, the *holy* who are perfectly delivered from Satan's power in the full accomplishment of their salvation. Among those who persis-

tently oppose, there are the abiding *sinners, unbelievers, condemned.* Let the opposite sides of this last clause also be carefully observed: Satan is *either* condemned to our advantage if we lay hold on *righteousness, or* we remain with him in condemnation if we continue as world in *sin.* By no means, as has been said, that the Spirit *now first* reproves the sin of those who do not oppose the powerless, condemned prince of this world;[1] for that would be a ὕστερον πρότερον in which the ἔλεγχος at the close would begin again at the beginning. But the reproof of *sin* was necessarily the first, and in that was everything included pertaining to it; but now, *after* the dilemma between sin and righteousness has been clearly exhibited, the Spirit finally testifies the condemnation of Satan. This He does, however, in such a way that He not only *comforts* believers with the expressed consolation of Rom. viii. 33, 34, but penetrates the *unbelieving* by a word of *most gracious offer* mingled with condemnation—*Will ye then* be and be for ever the devil's? Will ye be condemned with him?[2]

A not ungrounded observation, finally, and one which offers many useful reflections, particularly as confirming our exposition of the second clause, is the note of Bötticher—that the threefold office of the Holy Ghost has a corresponsive reference to the prophetical, high-priestly, and judicial offices of Christ.

Thus have we, as we would hope, done something toward the full understanding of this word of our Lord, which in its consequences and developments is altogether inexhaustible. We refrain from making more than one additional remark, and that is required to complete our exposition. It is, that *inasmuch* as the separation between believers and the world is not one which is at once complete, but some remains of the "world" are still in the disciples of Jesus, of course the Holy Ghost reproves *their* residue of unbelief, preaches to them reiteratedly the righteousness of Christ, sets before them more and more clearly

[1] As rightly, though in the wrong place, Helferich preaches against the disgrace of being conquered by one already conquered.

[2] Schleiermacher: "To convince the world of judgment, is to place it in the way of decision, whether it will walk with *that which* (him, who) has been already condemned, or with *that which* (Him, who) is ever proceeding from victory to victory."

the fundamental character of the difference between the Conqueror and the condemned one. As He shows to the altogether unbelieving not only their life and action, but, for example, also their books and systems thereto belonging, disclosing in these last the πρῶτον ψεῦδος, to be nothing but sin (peccatum and error), even so He reproves all in the not altogether believing which is not going ἐκ πίστεως εἰς πίστιν, every *last* yet remaining ψεῦδος of their life and teaching—as *sin* through want of faith in and obedience to the truth of the Spirit. O how different is the *judgment* of the Spirit here from that which we tolerant Christians are wont to exercise; and yet His previously disciplinary judgment is the type of the final judgment at the last day.

Ver. 12. It is not merely that the Lord here passes from the one side to the other, as if the connection were—All this will the Paraclete do to the world; *to you* on the other hand, etc. But ver. 12 must be closely connected in its transitional sense with what had just been said. The ἐλέγχειν of the Spirit was to be effected through the μαρτυρεῖν of the disciples (as they probably now very well understood in general): *they* consequently must previously know, and the Lord would have to say and commit to them, all that afterwards was to be spoken to the world. Still more, as we have just seen, they themselves, in order to their becoming perfect disciples, yea even fit and worthy witnesses, must (partly beforehand, and in part continuously) be subjected to the same *conviction.* Does not the risen Lord, therefore, whose coming with light, life, and peace, was a preparatory approach of the Spirit, reprove His disciples' unbelief? (Lu. xxiv. 25; Mar. xvi. 14.) Thus primarily and specifically concerning these three great things, sin, righteousness, and judgment, He has much more to say to His future witnesses which they should say to the world; similarly, apart from their office of testimony, for their own knowledge of the truth unto holiness and salvation *all* is embraced and hinted at in this Trilogy. Hence rightly Melanchthon: "The knowledge *of these things* is stupendous; that is, how great things sin and the anger of God are, and this victim of God, His own Son; how great is the glory of the reigning Messiah, how great the power of the devil, and how awful the contest between Christ and Satan:—the knowledge of all this is without limit." This is the most

obvious connection; but it must be understood that to the ἔτι πολλά much besides, yea everything belongs; and we may include it all, though Christ has not openly unfolded and perfectly told all, but left it to the teaching of the Spirit: for example, the abolition of the typical in the old covenant through its fulfilment in His sacrificial death and high-priesthood; the right position of the old law as it regards the new commandment of His new covenant; the relation of yet outstanding prophecy to the future and consummation of His kingdom—in short, everything generally which the Epistles bring in, and especially which the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Apocalypse in the great conclusion unfold. They only err who regard any one in particular of these points to be reserved here, without deducing it from the connection with vers. 8–11.

It is easy to show, further, against the accommodation theory of the old Rationalism, which is once more brought forward with pitiable simplicity, that *it* finds nothing reserved in this sentence: *our* readers will gladly enter with us a litle into this point. What the Lord had said was pure *truth* (ver. 7)—otherwise the ἔτι πολλά would have been quite misplaced; the opposite is afterwards *all*, the *whole* truth, and only that in as far as it was developed from what had been already said by our Lord. It may be enough for us to quote a sentence from one of the opponents of this theory. "Our enemies twist these words of our Lord *as if they meant*—Till now I have led you into many misconceptions; when He shall come, the Spirit of truth, He will lead you into *the truth*. Hitherto I have deceived you with many fallacies, I have nourished and confirmed your superstition; but in His time ye shall understand that I have deceived you by suffering you to remain in your hereditary delusions. Your practical reason, in its purity, shall liberate you from your superstitions, etc., etc.—But Jesus does not oppose His errors, by which He had misled the disciples, to the truth which they were afterwards to know; not impure truth to pure truth; but He opposes truth to truth, the pure to the pure, the less perfect however to the perfect, the *parts* of truth to the *entire* truth, the elementary institution of religion to its more sublime and thorough knowledge." (Weber.)

Ye cannot *bear* it, βαστάζειν—that is a more gracious and

stronger expression than if He had said, Ye cannot *receive* it, χωρεῖν. The critics who in their manner decide that βαστάζειν here is equivalent to *percipere*, *intelligere*, superficialise the sense (although the Syr. with its לְמֵאחַד takes the lead). The *bearing* is not merely the φρενὶ βαστάζειν of Suidas, the holding and retaining of that which is inwardly received: even the parallel in Epict. Enchirid. xxix. 5 which is generally adduced is far from being strictly parallel.[1] The Lord considers the weakness of their oppressed minds (hence the *now* referring to their *present* condition, their hearts being full of sorrow): that they cannot perfectly *understand* His words He presupposes already, and will therefore lay upon them no further, no too heavy burden. (Comp. in another yet similar sense, Matt. xxiii. 4.) To hear much from the Master and yet to understand little, oppresses—the disciples assuredly thought when He thus spake, Alas, what He *has said* lies unintelligibly heavy upon our souls! A further development and exposition of these great things would have altogether *weighed them down*, without the understanding which the Spirit should first bring. Thus His saying retains in its underlying presupposition the general meaning which refers it to the whole period of the disciples' learning from the Lord's lips, that they were not yet mature and strong enough for *understanding* Him; but there is something further to be added, and which should not be overlooked, since it is of great importance for our imitation of His wisdom and love in our own teaching. To pour out prematurely to the people the whole truth, is not only useless, because it is not understood or embraced, but *it is also positively hurtful*, since the weak cannot *bear* it, and may be *cast* down by it, that is, may be led to despair under the truth.

Ver. 13. We must here remark upon two things, before entering into the specific meaning of this clause: first, that the personal ἐκεῖνος is once more designedly placed before the otherwise sufficient τὸ πνεῦμα; and then, that after all we have heard in the ὑμᾶς we must include, though with some hidden

[1] To attribute to the people a premature knowledge, which has not been livingly experienced—"to urge a dawning consciousness into confession, to enforce testimonies and assertions, to force the unfolding of the inner life, to denounce in an unhappy manner human ignorance"—is no other than uncharitableness, and tends *not* to salvation. Nitzsch.

reservation still, all future disciples who should through the Spirit's conviction be won from the world by the truth. In this alone lies our right to appropriate to ourselves this promise. Instead of *εἰς πᾶσαν τὴν ἀλήθειαν* we read with Lachmann *εἰς τὴν ἀλήθειαν πᾶσαν*, so that (by a significant deviation from the usual *πᾶς ὁ—πᾶσα ἡ*) these two things are expressed in their full force: first, by the article, that it is only one and the self-same truth which Jesus and the Holy Ghost teach;[1] and then, by the *πᾶσαν*, closely and emphatically connected with the *ἀλήθειαν*, that in opposition and contrast the Holy Ghost alone will lead into the *whole* truth. It is otherwise, therefore, than when the woman in Mark v. 33 told the Lord *πᾶσαν τὴν ἀλήθειαν*, that is, without denying or deception. Such an antithesis to untruth (the pure simple truth, and nothing else) does indeed lie in the formula which we find in Plato, Apol. Soc. cap. 1, where Socrates opposes the deceiving complainants—*οὐδὲν ἀληθὲς εἰρήκασιν· ὑμεῖς δέ μου ἀκούσεσθε πᾶσαν τὴν ἀλήθειαν.* It is plain of itself that such a meaning is foreign to our passage, even if we adhere to the Text. Rec.; but it is a still stronger assurance against the theory of accommodation, that *τὴν ἀλήθειαν πᾶσαν* is the oldest and surest reading. Further, that it is not said that the Holy Ghost would give the disciples the solution and explanation of *omne scibile* in heaven and upon earth, is deducible from the signification of *the truth* which pervades the N. T. and St John's writings especially, according to which it embraces only the revealed truth of salvation; as well as from the article *τὴν* itself, as Bengel remarks, All *that* truth which I had now to tell you. Grotius, with equal correctness, says, The universality is to be restricted to that which is here concerned.[2] See in addition what we remarked before upon the *all* in ch. xiv. 26, and compare ch. xv. 15. The Holy Ghost will in this sense bring for the knowledge of salvation the *whole*, or, as de Wette[3] says, the *full* truth. But, strictly speaking, He will

[1] Bengel: The Scripture is not wont to say *truths*—a remark of immeasurable application to the error concealed in *our* way of speaking.

[2] The same restriction is in Mark v. 33, in the cited saying of Socrates, in Joseph. bell. jud. viii. 1, and generally in the nature of the case.

[3] Better than in his translation, where, in part wrongly, in part misunderstandingly, he says—lead you into the way to all truth.

not then first *bring* it; *the disciples* had already in a certain sense, with all the specific *reversion* here spoken of, the complete truth in the essentially perfect words of our Lord; the Holy Ghost was only to lead them *into* this truth, by opening their understanding, and giving to that understanding a complete and perfect system.

Many carry this too far when they regard the εἰς (with Lampe) as standing for ἐν simply,[1] and make the ὁδηγεῖν practically refer to the obedience of the truth, as elsewhere we have *walking in the* truth, or, according to such sayings as Ps. xxv. 5, cxliii. 10, cxix. 35. ("The truth of the Lord revealed in His word is considered as a *way to be trodden* by the Apostles and all the faithful.") Not so, but the perfecting of knowledge, the reversionary *saying* and *teaching* of what was not fully expressed by our Lord Himself, is here manifestly meant, as the connection with what precedes and what follows shows. But this teaching (and that is the truth in error of this exposition) is called a *leading*, because it must assuredly go hand in hand with the life and walk, because we must regard more as promised than merely, as Hess superficially explains, "the showing everything in the truest light"—or as the Vulg. briefly gives it—*Will teach you all the truth.* The living teaching of the Spirit is a guidance and leading into truth, in more senses than one. First, because it must assuredly presuppose, bring with it, require a constantly corresponding practical obedience, hence bringing no more to the inner and true understanding than the life is ripe for and fully willing to be guided by. Braune, "The Spirit will *lead*, the Christian must therefore *walk with* Him"—a saying of inexhaustible earnestness and force against all false appeal to the mere theoretical teaching of the Spirit. Then, the Spirit gives, as we see in the case of the Apostles, His solutions and explanations according to the need and the occasion (Matt. x. 19, 20)—just as in part at least the laws of Moses were given according to the emergencies which required them. "In the activity of his vocation a man attains the region of truth"—says Braune further. Thus while the *leading into* of itself indicates a *gradualness*, in opposition to the mechanical and childish notion that the Apostles at one bound were esta-

[1] Another reading, obviously to be rejected, has—ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ πάσῃ, followed by Nonnus.

blished in all truth on the day of Pentecost, we have to seek the reason and the measure of this gradualness both externally and internally; partly, in the internal ripening and progress of the Apostles themselves in their own holiness, with which their knowledge keeps pace—and partly in the stages of the way in which their vocation as witnesses led them through the world.

The *infallibility* of the Apostles, therefore, is not properly to be proved *from this passage.* For, at the outset, the same promise holds good for us all in its true meaning (1 Jno. ii. 27); and, further, this promise permits a progression of development. It is not true in itself that the Apostles never erred or went wrong in their common life; for, to every deficiency of holiness there corresponds in some sense a lack of knowledge, and every failure in perfect insight into the whole truth is of itself a relative, which easily brings about a positive, error. Thus, on the too generally adopted principle which carries back the "inspiration" of the *Scripture* to the persons of the writers and their life generally, we get no infallible Scripture. The Holy Spirit, however, who protected them from all error in their *office*, as was promised in ch. xv. 27, has actually given in the most specific *concentration of their official gift* a new *Scripture* as the conclusion of the old; and that *this Scripture* possesses the same infallibility (at least!) which Jesus incontrovertibly assigns to the Old Testament—is a truth which, though it is not to be proved by any dictum or dogma from without, *attests itself* ever more and more clearly, *bears witness* to its own claims against every new contradiction that arises, and to the sincere approves itself in all its plerophory down to its minutest letter.[1]

When the Lord promises that the Spirit should guide them into *the* truth, and ever more perfectly into the entire and full truth, He did indeed presuppose and imply that which we before

[1] But that a proper inspiration is expressed concerning the Old Testament only in such passages as 2 Tim. iii. 15, 16; 1 Pet. i. 19–22; 2 Pet. i. 19–21, this not being extended to the New Testament (Lutz, Bibl. Dogm. S. 429, as also that Rev. i. 19 places the revelation in the *seeing*, not in the *writing*)—is a marvellous assertion of a theology which is not based upon deep thinking, and is not altogether orthodox in faith. See on the other hand in Petersen Lehre v. d. Kirche i. 184 how and wherefore the Apostles, otherwise fallible, were infallible in *writing*.

rejected as His main meaning—that He would speak and teach nothing but truth, no lie. He *now* makes *this* prominent by a γάρ, which, however, does not strictly connect itself with the last word, but with the name *the Spirit of the truth.* There is a spirit of lying which blinds the world into unbelief, ruling it as its prince; the Spirit proceeding from the Father opposes Himself to this spirit—He can testify only the truth. Every other so-called "truth" will be opposed and condemned by Him as the lie of the liar from the beginning. Condescendingly, and at the same time convincingly, on account of this unhappily existing opposite, the Lord attributes to his Representative the same thing which He had so often asserted of Himself—the *not speaking of Himself.* Comp. ch. vii. 16–18, viii. 26, 28, xii. 49, 50, and what we have there said in explanation. In the same hypothetical and accommodating spirit, for the sake of distinction from the False in the world, as the Lord spoke there, it holds good here of the Holy Ghost. In a true sense the Spirit, like the Son, speaks assuredly from Himself, of His own, for the property of God in His three Hypostases is the truth; but in that evil sense of a *self* separate from God (the *impossibility* of which as it regards the Son and the Spirit must be maintained), He will not, and He cannot speak (ch. viii. 44). *He who* speaketh to us, and *that which* speaketh in us ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ—in the sense of Godless self and creaturely independence—leads us astray *from* the truth, comes from the liar, is a lie. Here it is important to distinguish and take heed before all things of what is called "spirit" in the world, or even in ourselves! "If the Holy Ghost may not speak of Himself, and out of Himself—O Preacher! how canst thou draw thy preaching out of thyself, out of thine head (or even *heart)?*" (Gossner.) Let nothing of thy preaching and testimony come from thine own mere impulse and will to know and to teach, before the Spirit hath taught and impelled thee![1]

But what He *shall hear* or *heareth:* similarly as the Son hath heard of the Father. But *here* we find not—*From the Father;* and we join *Kling's* protest against Lücke's simply so understanding it. "If we think of the Spirit as it were *by the side*

[1] "The true prophets are never *willing*-prophets." Berlenb. Bibel.

of the Son, hearing from the Father like the Son, the entire relation is disturbed, and the subordinate and incorrect standing-point of the Greek Church is entered upon at once." And this is expressly contradicted by vers. 14, 15, according to which the Spirit receives from the treasures of the Son, while all is again of the Father. Not therefore again,—of Me; but—What He will hear or heareth in the mutual counsel of the triune Godhead,[1] in the eternal converse between the Father and the Son, the Son and the Father, the revelation of which is first the word of the Son itself, the exposition of which then the same Spirit brings who hath received and searched into *all* which is God's, the *hidden things as well as the revealed* (הַנִּסְתָּרֹת וְהַנִּגְלֹת, Deut. xxix. 28), the counsels of the Father as well as the testimonies of the Son, from all eternity. Mark the ὅσα ἂν for this all-embracing meaning, which at once leads to what follows! *Therefore* He already knoweth what will yet in the future be, and the Son hath not yet expressly told; therefore He will also foretell τὰ ἐρχόμενα.[2] In this extension of the words which point to what the Spirit hath heard, and will fore-announce, we must be careful of limiting the expression by an incorrect adherence to the thoughts which then gave rise to the declaration, and which it had immediately in view. Assuredly, the fact is involved that what the Spirit testifies as *true* will confirm and *evidence* its truth by *coming:*—the fulfilment of it will impress its final seal upon all His testimony. But *the things to come* with the definite article says more; it refers actually to the whole futurity, as of the individual so also of the church. Not only that through the power of the Spirit "every man may become his own prophet, and predict in his own consciousness what he has to expect in the future"[3]—not only that a certain prophesying of the future, with regard to our own life and

[1] Luther: "In the eternal Godhead, with Christ and the Father, where He seeth and knoweth all no other than it is." We would not assert, with Luthardt, that in this thoroughly trinitarian context neither the Father nor the Son is to be thought of, but only "God," in connection with the "hearing;" but his remark is more correct, that in ὅσα ἂν ἀκούσῃ is meant —What He from time to time will hear, as the emerging occasion requires.

[2] It is wrong to press the ἀνά in ἀναγγέλλειν, as if it meant—*Again* announce, expound what had been already said.

[3] As Herberger preaches in the Herz-Postille.

the times in which we live with their results, may be afforded by the Spirit when occasion may demand it. But the Lord, rather, promises here pre-eminently, as the fulfilment shows, that the Holy Ghost will, at the close of the Scripture which embraces the beginning and the end, yet more clearly and perfectly than ever before foretell the whole process of the kingdom of God to the end. Was not this a knowledge actually left in reversion by our Lord's words, which had intimated only the nearest and most distant facts of eschatology in the destination of Jerusalem and the final judgment? Did not the church need a decisive harmonising revelation concerning the relation of what had already come to pass in Christ to the great future which is predicted in the Old Testament prophets? And that is, after both St Peter and St Paul had paved the way by isolated utterances, the *Apocalypse* confided to St John. If this be regarded as unapostolical and spurious, we do not simply ask where would be the conclusion of the Bible, but where would be the worthy and perfect accomplishment of the word which St John has here in his Gospel recorded? We should have then to wait for a still further *ἀναγγέλλειν τὰ ἐρχόμενα* of the Holy Ghost! This indeed we may and ought to hope for, in as far as the announcements of the Holy Ghost were not absolutely closed with the apostolical age, in as far as the exposition and full accomplishment of His words go on to the end of the days. But in as far as a canonical foundation is laid through the Apostles for all instruction—as no man understanding anything of the system of God's kingdom and its Scripture can ever deny—such a close of the canon of prophecy was of itself to be presumed upon and expected. And now let him who hath ears to hear, hear what in Patmos *the Spirit* saith unto the churches through the bosom-disciple who was *in the Spirit* on the Lord's day! Let him see how here *the testimony of Jesus* Himself is fully completed as the *Spirit of prophecy*, and the mystery of God, as He announced it to His servants the prophets, appears in its final concentration—how *the Spirit* brings from the Lord, who is the Alpha and the Omega, a final "*I come quickly!*" and responds to His voice with the answering bride, "*Come, Lord Jesus!*" in the *Amen* which ratifies all! Assuredly, St John's Apocalypse is the most real fulfilment of the

word—The Spirit will show you things to come; and all further prophesying finds in it at least its text, even as all the teaching and testifying of the Spirit from the day of Pentecost downward has merely expounded what God from the beginning had already spoken in the Old and New Testaments through His Son, the Mediator and Angel of the covenant.

Ver. 14. The light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the πρόσωπον, the face and *person* of Jesus Christ (2 Cor. iv. 6), is the great and final end, beyond which no self-manifestation of the triune God is possible. The glorification of the Father in the personality of Him who already as the eternal Son was His countenance turned on the creature, and now as the Son of man in a most perfect personal expression of God has become its Restorer, is at the same time the glorification of Jesus Christ Himself—but this will be consummated before His disciples, and in them only by the Holy Ghost. He *shall glorify Me*—in this the Lord names the inmost centre of the whole truth, around which the periphery of its manifold development revolves; as also the most decisive test for every spirit of lying which would intrude into the place of the Holy Ghost, for all fanaticism as well as all Rationalism, all apocalypses and all dogmas and traditions which lead not to Christ and glorify not Him. "By this is decided in an anti-Montanist manner the question concerning the perfectibility of Christendom"—says Lücke excellently in few words. And Bengel with equal propriety from another point of view, concerning the Romish traditions: plus quam elementares sunt et nunc etiam *minus* ab iis, qui Paracletam habent, *ferri possunt*. Luther's critical canon, so often misunderstood by others and alas by himself, applied with too little insight sometimes, is perfectly correct *in thesi*—What preaches Jesus, and leads to faith in Him, is of the Holy Ghost. For as the Son speaketh of the Father and glorifieth the Father, even so speaketh the Holy Ghost of the Son and *glorifieth the Son*.[1]

[1] He glorifieth Him also in truth by an ever-increasing disclosure of His glory. Roos (Lehre J. Chr.) combines John xvii. 4 with this passage, and says, "We thus find nothing in the writings of the Apostles concerning the glory of the *Father* which had not previously occurred in the words of Jesus; but on the *glory of Jesus* the Apostles, under the illumination of

This is more clearly unfolded and established in the following word, by which the Lord perfectly closes the circle of the Holy Three-One, and places the revelation of the Spirit in its right relation to that which is the Father's and the Son's. For He will take *of that which is Mine* in what He will show—whence otherwise, being the Spirit of the Son as well as of the Father? That means, "not of the high things of the creation, of the many worlds of the universe," will He speak to you (as Oetinger says), but of the kingdom of God in Me and My redemption; the saving truth, whose centre I am, will He announce, and complete it by prophecy down to the last *things to come*. But this involves so strict a relation to the already spoken word, as well as to the yet reserved treasures of the Son, that no revelation of the Spirit going beyond this can be supposed possible. For, in the first place, the Spirit, as we heard in chap. xiv. 26, takes, makes prominent, and develops out of the words which Jesus had spoken, His own; so that nothing quite new, and which had not been expressed or intimated, is to come through Him.[1] But then, secondly, what new He brings, as far as it is new, comes from the reserved treasure of which ἔτι πόλλα ἔχω speaks. This is *also* the meaning, for otherwise there would be no foundation for what follows—All things that the Father hath are Mine. The Spirit, as we have already said, does not hear, as it were by the side of the Son, the Father alone; but all that He speaketh He hath heard also of the Son. The Son in His human nature hath inherited all, but this inheritance is His original eternal possession. This *all*, however, cannot by any means be said to

the *Comforter*, have taught much which Jesus in the days of His flesh never uttered concerning Himself; and to this belongs not merely the full exhibition of His Priestly and Kingly offices, but this also, that He is directly called God."—We leave this to be pondered, as far as it is true; but think that the glory of the Father also was still further illustrated, according to 2 Cor. iv. 6.

[1] It helps the unbelieving Christian world little, in their rejection of a development of testimony in the Apostles, to recur deceptively "to the original pure teaching of Christ;" the convincing Spirit makes their *conscience* find even in that teaching of Jesus the entire apostolical system, even as in this last the whole genuine "doctrine of the Church." And this will serve for the limitation and right adjustment of the previous quotation from Roos.

have been *explicitly* and literally communicated already in the words of our Lord down to His ascension, or in those of the Apostles in the beginning of the church; therefore as the Apostles in the freedom of the Spirit add new discourses to the Lord's discourses, so also the same Spirit leadeth us, in His application and exposition of them, into new testimonies and confessions of the church which are not always to be judged by and restricted to the apostolical *letter*.[1] Retaining, however, most assuredly the spirit of this letter, for on the other hand all the new lies *implicitly* in the old. That which the Holy Ghost may say, from His first coming to the end, is new as it respects the former word only by illustrating and glorifying *it*;[2] even as the Christ whom He preaches is in some sense another and yet no other, as it respects the "historical Christ" of the Gospels. To go back still further: All that the Lord spake in the flesh in such wise that it might afterwards be unfolded in the Spirit, was in its germ and principle contained in the Old Testament; for every word of God by the מַלְאָךְ of His face and the רוּחַ הַקֹּדֶשׁ is a word of Christ. "The full harmonious close of all the words of Jesus is Spirit; the testimony of Jesus is the kernel and spirit of all the prophets." (Oetinger.) To him who learns to understand this Christ is so glorified that he can set his seal to these words of Jesus, in which He can and must say concerning all *understanding of Scripture*—which includes again all testimony of the Spirit[3]—He will take *of Mine*. The Holy Ghost *testifies* of Jesus (ch. xv. 26)—that is the beginning of His office in the world; He *glorifieth* Jesus—that is the goal and end of His office in believers.

[1] Hence Luther's celebrated saying must be modified in consistency with this:—The devil easily would lead me astray, if I walk *out of Scripture-ground*.

[2] So that the church of these last ages may, having before it the entire history of the kingdom through which the Spirit had led it, more clearly and profoundly understand and more plainly express, than the original writers themselves, many things in the apostolical writings:—but the Spirit in the Apostles *meant* and *said* only this from the beginning. What caution is needed upon this subject see stated in the weighty note, S. 541–546, in Oetinger's Theosophie by Auberlen.

[3] See the Apocalypse, flowing almost entirely as it does from prophetic words! And if the Spirit does not always proceed, in His testimony of truth, directly from Scripture, He yet leads and directs us back infallibly into it.

It is obvious, finally, that as certainly as the leading into all truth is an internal teaching which carries the life and experience with it, the glorification of Christ *before us* must coincide with the appropriating establishment of His image *in us*;—although this is not specifically mentioned, but the discourse clings to the *ἀναγγέλλειν*. There is no other receiving of this glorifying light, no other living growing and becoming perfect in it, than that which takes place according to 2 Cor. iii. 17, 18.

Ver. 15. The honour of the *Father* could not be left without its positive expression: we have found this pervading all these farewell discourses, but the Trinitarian expression and winding up of all culminates in this passage. From that earliest, "What seek ye? Come and see!" to the first disciples—from the following more penetratingly questioning and more plainly offering testimonies to Nicodemus and the Samaritan woman (to the man of knowledge—the mysteries of regeneration and His exaltation on the cross, the grounds of judgment; to the ignorant woman—the true gift of God for her sin, the true prayer)—through testimonies, ever rising higher and yet ever condescending lower, to the dignity, power, and honour of the *Son*, in whom alone is the *sinner's* salvation—by all these has the selection of our Lord's discourses in St John's Gospel paved the way for these last-spoken words in the narrow circle of the disciples, words which, as we have seen, become more and more *apocalyptical* for the future explanation of the Spirit, when He should *come* and again speak of *Him who was still to come*. Assuredly, as has been often admitted, and more often felt without admitting, not till the church of the last time will this pre-Apocalypse be altogether explained and glorified in the light of the Spirit.[1] Meanwhile, all who honestly hang on the Lord as living branches feed upon it with still increasing knowledge; for the deep and inexhaustible things are clothed in the plainest simplest words, inviting us as if they were perfectly revealed. So is it also with the doctrine of the Triunity of the Father, the Son, and the Spirit, which runs through these

[1] Generally, the whole Gospel of St John, which we elsewhere called "the higher and highest Apocalypse," corresponds, in its mystical depths for knowledge and life combined, to the last perfect development of the church.

chapters; in which the Spirit appears with more and more personal characteristics, and at the same time the unity of the Three is more and more firmly established as the close comes. Simple faith finds here already the whole truth; the doctrinal investigation of the church finds here its firmest *dicta probantia*, its surest limitations within which it may range, as also its not yet attained goal.

Glorify *Me*, take of *Mine*—to this belongs necessarily, again, All things that *the Father* hath are *Mine!* See ch. xvii. 10, where this last and highest word, which it could become the glorified Son alone to say, is found by the side of—All Mine are Thine! Here belongs Col. ii. 2, 3. When the Lord now rises from the announcement of an economical impartation, ver. 14, to the eternal foundation of all in the interior, essential, eternally trinitarian relationship, He does *not* repeat (as might have been expected, and has therefore been read) the previous λήψεται, but substitutes for it a λαμβάνει, in strict parallel with ὅσα ἔχει and ἐμά ἐστι. Thus there is opened to us a glimpse into the living blessed bond of love in receiving and giving in the eternal ground of the triune essence of the Godhead. The Father hath from eternity given to the Son to have life and all things in Himself, yet only as He is the Son who revealeth the Father, only as the Fatherhood remaineth with the Father. But all things the Son bringeth and giveth to the Father again, honoureth and glorifieth Him in His being glorified in His people. And this through the *Spirit*, who with equal rights in this unity, *taketh* from the sole fulness of the Father and the Son, all that He livingly offers in His announcement—in order finally, in the consummate glorification and unity of love, to bring back the redeemed church through the Son to the Father; as is afterwards (ch. xvii.) *in the Spirit*, therefore without naming the Spirit, declared in prophetic prayer. Although then the recurring διὰ τοῦτο εἶπον—ἀναγγελεῖ ὑμῖν leads back the discourse into the economical λήψεται, yet it is grounded upon the relation of essence which was indicated in the λαμβάνει: the Spirit who proceedeth from the Father, proceedeth as truly and essentially, since the Father and the Son are one, from the Son also. Hence Luther expounds, as if he read λαμβάνει: "He taketh *His own*, that is"

—not merely what He testifies and imparts in the church, but, because He indeed gives Himself, mediates the indwelling of God (ch. xiv. 23)—"the Divine nature in eternity not only from the Father, but also from Christ; and thus there abideth one eternal essence or Divinity of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, but in distinctive persons"—which *Persons*, as we must speak of them humanly, as the *complement* to the πρόσωπον of Christ, are again incontrovertibly designated by ἔχει, ἐμά, λαμβάνει. Luther, once more, "This is the circle round and complete; all Three, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost in one eternal Divine nature:—thus the Holy Ghost is Himself true God, without any difference, only that He hath it both from the Father and the Son."

THE WAY OF THE FIRST DISCIPLES, AS TYPICAL FOR ALL FUTURITY, THROUGH SORROW TO JOY; THE JOY OF BIRTH; THE PERFECT JOY OF SEEING HIM AGAIN IN THAT DAY.

(Ch. xvi. 16–24.)

Thus has the Lord, after so condescending a commencement with lower themes, risen as He always does to speak of high, yea of the highest mysteries: or, what is the same thing, He has penetrated into the depths of God, where the Spirit heareth, and whence He taketh the things which are the Father's and the Son's, in order to announce and to bring them to the church. And He has herein once more anticipated the distant future, reached forward to the great conclusion of all the truth, and the perfect revelation, when *all things* that the Father hath, and which are likewise the Son's, shall be proclaimed, taught, predicted, and confirmed in their fulfilment. The disciples *hear* indeed what Jesus speaks, but they *apprehend* it not. This He also well knows, and yet He must speak it. But after He has done justice to the preparatory testimony which was necessarily given concerning the work, office, and person of the Holy Ghost (vers. 14, 15, is the proper final close of *this* testimony)—He can as it were stoop once more to the weakness of the disciples' present condition. He therefore now begins anew to

speak to their terrified hearts concerning that which *first of all* and *immediately* should result from and after His departure to the Father. This also, indeed, must partake of the spirit of His recent words, and be immediately glorified into a type of the way and the future of all His disciples;—and soon His word in vers. 22–24 has again reached forward even to the full glory and joy of *that day*, which only *dawns* in the new birth of His resurrection, but will be consummate in another, the final return.—What a transition, or rather what a return back, between vers. 15 and 16; from the depths of the triune essence of the Godhead to the immediately near present of His disciples' destiny, to the great change of the now impending day! There is, as for Himself the breaking through death into life, so for the disciples a deeply penetrating, fundamental *change from sorrow to joy*. By no means merely their sorrow at His death, and their joy in His living again, after the analogy of the sorrow and joy of the children of men in their changing experience; but as the mediating expression of an essential internal process which the Holy Ghost completed in their own case, and which still goes on to the end of all. Thus as this *way of the disciples through sorrow to joy* between the cross and the resurrection of our Lord was already for themselves something preparatory and typical, it becomes to us a type of the way which *all His future disciples* have also to pass through, all those who are to be won through the conviction of the Spirit out of the unbelieving world;—a way through that godly sorrow which at first distinguishes them fully from the world, into the joy of faith and life in the Holy Ghost. That which the *μικρόν* and *πάλιν μικρόν* of the departure of Jesus embraces during the few days of the Apostles' waiting is a prophetic mirror for the course of the whole church, for the great interval from His going away till His return in a wider sense. Let this be taken preliminarily for the general indication of the sense from ver. 16 to ver. 24; in which section vers. 16–21 treat of the *sorrow* (necessary to the birth which is here in question), and then immediately vers. 22–24 of that certainly following, increasing, and finally consummate *joy*.

Ver. 16. The Lord had spoken similarly in ch. vii. 33 to the Jews, in ch. xiii. 33, and more directly ch. xiv. 19, to the dis-

ciples—but now first does He bring it closely home to them. The word and the thoughts, at least in the *first two* clauses (the bond of connection of the third introduces a difficulty), appear *to us* now very simple and plain; but the longer we pause before the word the more cause do we find to *ask*, even as expositors, What is it that He saith? Ch. xiv. 19 is however distinguished from the present words, in that here not merely are *the disciples* included as for a while, like the world, *not* seeing Him (this was there also hinted); but the *seeing again*, which is promised to them, is connected also with a gracious πάλιν μικρόν, coming very near.[1] This of itself is enough to prove that the ancients were not absolutely wrong when they referred the clause to the Lord's *resurrection;* this is incontrovertibly the most immediate meaning of the letter of the contrast between ὄψεσθε and οὐ θεωρεῖτε (if the one removes the bodily visibility, the other gives it back again). The plain parallel in ch. xiv. 19 proves the same, as also ver. 22 of this chapter, where it is impossible to dissever the resurrection from ὄψομαι ὑμᾶς. Olshausen is therefore incorrect in saying, "All the better expositors are now agreed that a reference to the bodily resurrection is not here the *direct* acceptation;" while he (in company with *almost* all modern interpreters, headed by Luther and Calvin) interprets the promise as referring *only* to an internal spiritual seeing. It would be better to say that the sight of the Lord returning in the resurrection is the *first* meaning;[2] and to admit that the ancients in *going no further* were wrong also on their part. The error on both sides is no other than a forgetfulness of the *typical-prophe-*

[1] That μικρόν points *in both cases* to an interval needs no proof, on account of the πάλιν. The translation is false, therefore, which gives, And then shall ye *for a while*, a little time, see Me (as if κατὰ μικρόν)—*for* I go (presently *again*) My way to the Father!

[2] Luthardt does me some justice here: "That the return of Christ to His church is in a manner promised; the disciples are referred to the transitory return of their Lord and their brief communion with Him, as a pledge of His future return." In fact, it may well be so, for the letter speaks undeniably of the resurrection. But we assert something more and different from this: The Lord does not speak of a *transitory* communion as the type of that which was only *future*, as if between the two intervened a long separation and orphanhood, but of the real beginning of an *abiding* fellowship and union through the Spirit.

tical perspective, which is so habitually left out of view. This we must persist in re-asserting, and point to it as the alone satisfactory hermeneutical principle for the solution of these last predictions of Jesus, just as we had reason to do upon Matt. xxiv. The prophetic word receives its first full fulfilment in the future of the Spirit, according to its spiritual and most essential meaning; but it *connects itself in its expression* with the typical event which presents the more immediate future as already present. B.-Crusius is in the right direction, "As ver. 20 seq. speak of that sensible re-appearance, this may be the meaning already in our passage." As, for the unbelieving world, the *seeing* of the Judge coming in the clouds, according to ch. xxvi. 64, *begins* with the first announcement of His victory over death and of His justification, but then reaches onward to the last day —just so the seeing of the Lord, which is known by faith, in the light and by the glorification of the Spirit, actually begins in the case of the disciples on the morning of the resurrection and goes on through the ascension and pentecost. The *day of life, of the Spirit* which was suddenly to follow upon the suddenly darkening night of death, and which the Lord promises as the time of a seeing no longer to cease, extends in its grand all-comprehending aspect from the resurrection-morning to—the full consummation of every individual, as of the whole church. The return of the Lord, of which ver. 22 ὄψομαι ὑμᾶς is spoken, has its great commencement in the resurrection, but is not fulfilled in its last and deepest sense until that return which was already spoken of in ch. xiv. 3[1]—thus in His taking to Himself (as we there expounded) the individual, and in His parousia at the end for the entire church.[2] So far is Augustin not altogether wrong, when he referred it to this last and proper return after His departure to the Father. But all these critical points must be embraced in one, if we would extract from the meaning of the Lord's word to the first disciples the meaning which it contained *for us all.*

Bengel thinks that ὄπτειν, as compared with θεωρεῖν, has a

[1] Which Klee perceives, but exhibits it in a one-sided and ungrounded manner.

[2] Compare the correct exposition in Göschel, in his doctrine of the last things (Berlin 1850).

meaning *magis cum affectu*, and would make this an argument for a spiritual beholding, with joy and clear apprehension: but when we regard the words rigorously, their θεωρεῖν would rather (as in earlier passages) be the spiritual beholding, ὄπτειν on the other hand (as is plain in ver. 22) the physical seeing. We hold the truth to be that the *not seeing* and *seeing* in both cases is to be understood first as bodily, using this as the expression for the subsequent reference to spiritual seeing. While the disciples saw not Jesus, their faith in Him, their seeing Him as the Son of God, was obscured and almost taken away.

The whole *passion*, the full deep *suffering of death*, in which, even for Himself, such immeasurable elements of woe conspired, is contemplated by the Lord as a brief transition, and He passes joyfully over it by His πάλιν μικρόν. *For* in that and after that He dies, He goeth only *to the Father*, to His own glorification, see ch. xiv. 28. This of itself somewhat explains the striking clause with ὅτι,[1] which has its difficulty still when more closely examined, and concerning which Tholuck too boldly says, "This ὅτι would be perfectly unintelligible if the Lord spoke of *bodily* seeing." Certainly, if of this *alone;* but our exposition knows better. V. Gerlach more cautiously and correctly remarks, "The difficulty for the disciples lay in this *because* of the going away, and *therefore* of the seeing; if they had apprehended all which went before, they would have presently found the solution of this new word also, which ceased to be a mystery after all that had passed." Had not the Lord opened His whole discourse (ch. xiv. 3) with "going away *and coming again?*" Did not this coming again occur to them most plainly in the ὄψεσθέ με? But this being plain, and giving them the clue to His meaning, should not the ὅτι ὑπάγω come in before as belonging only to the οὐ θεωρεῖτέ με? So Pfenninger (whose zeal for making everything plain and square often leads his otherwise keen insight astray) interposes arbitrarily—"for *in the interval* I go to the Father!" (Against which ch. xx. 17 is to be observed.) The Lord designedly did not thus set forth His παροιμία, His enigmatical word; the going to the Father is made the foundation of the entire double clause, indeed, taking into

[1] Its absence in many Codd. is certainly an omission, as ver. 17 shows. Tischendorff very improperly leaves out these words.

account the nearer connection and the *predominant tone of promise* which falls on the *πάλιν*, especially of the seeing again and the return. Though from the *going away*, the not seeing seems immediately to follow, but this only presses the paradox into the deeper thought which was prepared for in ch. xiv. 28:—My departure *to the Father* leads Me to honour and glory, by means of which I can reveal Myself to you after, and in consequence of, My death. (Braune excellently puts it, "He is not withdrawn into the *realm of shades* from which *no return* is possible, but to the glory of the Father, whence He can continually and for ever reveal Himself to His own.") Still more explicitly, after all this: My death and departure to God is that of the High Priest, for redemption, the opening of heaven, the preparing your place, the obtaining the Spirit—and from this would arise to their minds the deeper view, that He would not give Himself *permanently* to be seen in the body, but *in the higher manner of the Spirit* continue it, a final visible manifestation being the final and glorious necessary consequence of all. But what is said is spoken in obscure intimation, Ye shall *see* not merely My victory over the power of death, which cannot hold Me, and through this My return from the grave, but ye shall go on to see soon (all a *πάλιν μικρόν*) My ascension to the Father also, ye shall see Me in this My way, and be altogether satisfied with My departing and yet remaining. One is almost tempted to translate, Ye shall see Me, *that* or *how*, forsooth, I go to the Father—but this would be improper as being contrary to the arrangement of the sentence, which, like every stimulating enigma-word, must be as simple in its expression as profound in its meaning.

Not all the disciples inquire and seek in express words the meaning of what had been said; there are some who do, but St John does not name them, any more than he names himself—assuredly one among those who pondered *in silence*, and probably having some slight understanding. They are not sufficiently bold, even after the encouragement of ver. 5, to ask the Master Himself, for they have also to reflect upon the constant allusion to a future understanding. But as they surround Him, speaking about His words half aloud, they gradually take time and get more courage. The *words* they understand and retain

well, so that they can literally repeat them; but they do not apprehend their meaning, therefore twice, *What is this that He saith?* First, the twofold prediction, and the strange reason assigned for both; then, spelling it out, they take it to pieces (Bengel, They disjoin the two conjunct words), hence the καὶ ὅτι, and that with a strengthening ἐγώ.[1] Thus do they confuse themselves over the mystery, without asking Him as the Jews did, ch. vii. 36. It was natural that the most startling word, that which finally obtruded itself upon them, would be the μικρόν; and at last they limit themselves to this, with a previous τοῦτο, indicating that they embraced all in this one word. *So near* was the great turning-point to be, the sorrow and joy, the seeing and not seeing of which they cannot understand, *because* it is stated to be near! The result is, *We know not what He saith*—in which they unconsciously utter a general confession applicable to *all* His discourses. The apparently diffuse and prolix style of description here is notwithstanding perfectly precise in its distinctive shades of expression, down to the slightest turn.[2] The εἶπον οὖν and ἔλεγον οὖν (even with the καί between), do not indicate, as Lampe thinks, different words of different parties; but the same *some of His disciples* is the subject, though they are speaking to *one another*. They are not able at once to ask, but they revolve the question and His word in their thoughts; and their οὐκ οἴδαμεν passes finally into that which Jesus remarks, encourages, and anticipatingly responds to before it is uttered—Now *we will* ask *Him* instead of one another!"

Ver. 19. "Christ repeats to them the words once more *which St John also recites*, because they contain matter of permanent thought and embarrassment to His people." So does the Berlenb. Bibel hit the true emphasis of the seven times recurring "little while"—the title given to the *Jubilate* between Easter and Pentecost, and which gives the profound reason of the true *jubilate* which should spring in a little while from the *plorabitis et flebitis*. St John tells us that they *desired* to ask Him, only that he may show us that Jesus *marked* it. But Jesus, humbling them, and yet humbling Himself to their thoughts, first

[1] Which may be genuine the second time, in the repetition.

[2] Thus we see no reason for changing the Text. Rec. to suit Rinck's lucubrations.

touches their *inquiring among themselves;* and then once more declares to them, in prophecy still, what He had before said (but without the *I go away*);—thus seeming to say, Do ye contend about these plain words? But He then goes on to take them for the text of a yet more plain and penetrating prospective explanation of the *experience which should presently befall the disciples.*

Ver. 20. He designedly omits the *going to the Father*, as this would have required Him once more to lament over or reprove them for their not understanding it. But the *not* seeing and *yet* seeing *again* He now describes still more plainly by its *effects*, or rather by the position in which it will place the disciples; and His *Amen, Amen*, is the preface of a plain declaration how it will be with their souls. *Ye shall weep and lament*—Ye shall mourn over Me as dead! Ye shall see Me go as by a fearful dying into death! This κλαύσετε καὶ θρηνήσατε is more than the only similar πενθεῖν καὶ κλαίειν of Mark xvi. 10. For the words run just like the ordinary *wailing for the dead*, concerning which θρηνεῖν (Luke xxiii. 27, vii. 32), and θρῆνος (Matt. ii. 18; 2 Sam. i. 17; Jer. ix. 17), in particular were used. This of itself was dreadful enough for the poor disciples—Lamentation of death over the Son of the living God, their sole unfailing Comforter! But now to deepen it follows the joy of the world, not for the sake of referring to the world—which would be inappropriate here—but to intensify the word for the disciples. No man will comfort you or sympathise with your sorrows; rather will the whole of the rest of the world around you rejoice over that which is your sorrow, and laugh at and mock you. They will rejoice that they are rid of Me, as they will imagine, Ps. xxii. 18, xli. 9. They will institute a new Purim feast, days of prosperity and joy, in which to congratulate one another with gifts, as if Haman the Jews' enemy hung on the cross. This rejoicing of the world is the keenest sword to weakness and unbelief, as well as to the true dependence of the sorrowful disciples trusting in God. (Ps. xlii. 11.) Once more the Lord condenses, for the ὑμεῖς thus set in opposition to the κόσμος, all into one deep Λυπηθήσεσθε,[1]

[1] We must not read ὑμεῖς δέ, for the antithesis does not any longer point backward, but forward in the ἀλλά.

concerning which B.-Crusius says with right feeling, "λυπεῖσθαι is still more than the θρηνεῖν and κλαίειν." But *now* the seeing again and the *joy!* By a *saying* (ἐν παροιμίαις) very common in ordinary human life and in Scripture the Lord describes the change and transition which should in their case take place in a peculiar and incomparable sense. As it is written in Esth. ix. 22, concerning the ungodly, revengeful joy of the saved Jews,[1] which nevertheless was a feeble type of a better joy,—נֶהְפַּךְ לָהֶם מִיָּגוֹן לְשִׂמְחָה וּמֵאֵבֶל לְיוֹם טוֹב (Sept. ἐστράφη αὐτοῖς ἀπὸ πένθους εἰς χαράν)—just so does the Lord here speak, probably not without an echo of this well-known formula, which would then contain a secret ironical allusion to the *reversal* of the false Israelites' Purim. If such a reference seems too farfetched or inappropriate, we find the saying concerning the conversion of sorrow into joy often enough recurring in all kinds of forms, as in Ps. xxx. 12 (com. Job xxx. 31), and see particularly Jer. xxxi. 13. The expression here is heightened to the utmost, however, since the sorrow is *itself* to *become* joy; it is not merely to be lost in or exchanged for joy, but the subject and ground of the sorrow becomes the subject and ground of the joy. This is here true in an abounding sense: the cross of our Lord is glorified into an eternal consolation; *out of* the sorrow at the cross and the sepulchre, because in it there was the believing and loving seeking of the Crucified, *is born* their joy in the Living, Risen One, who goes before into the heavens. The same holds good as a universal promise to all sorrow which is not sorrow of the world, but λύπη κατὰ θεόν—which can no longer rejoice where the world exults. Those who weep bear already the precious seed which rises again into sheaves of joy —"on the flood of tears we float out of ruin"—suffering was to the disciples as to their Lord the necessary and afterwards thankfully acknowledged passage to bliss.

Christians, as we shall hereafter more definitely show, may hope for an ever new repetition of this change. When the world is in sorrow it still has a hope that sorrow will be turned

[1] It is to intimate this that Mordecai, led by the Holy Ghost, throughout the whole of this book which shows us Israel at the lowest depth in which it was recognised and even defended as the people of God—suppresses the *name of God* and the word *prayer*.

again into joy, and externally and for a while its hope is often fulfilled; but all the more certainly will the final separation take place at the last. The Lord does not *here* expressly say that all the joy of the world must finally be turned into woe, because that *at present* does not conduce either to His own or His people's joy, and because He would avoid every appearance of a reciprocation of gladness in the world's righteous condemnation.[1] But this was also to be understood: see Lu. vi. 25.

Ver. 21. The definite ἡ γυνή begins once more in a proverbial, figurative tone, and sets clearly before us the similitude to be explained afterwards. No accusative was wanted with the ὅταν τίκτῃ, for τίκτειν stands absolutely for ὠδίνειν or κύειν, as frequently appears. And so we find γεννᾷν as here used of the mother (Gal. iv. 24; Matt. i. 25, ii. 1), although not often, and for the most part not without a special emphasis which expresses rather the perfected bringing forth of that which was already begotten, than the simple bearing in itself. What would be the father's begetting if the mother did not bring forth and give full birth to the offspring? Hers is thus the decisive labour of sorrow therein! Augustine would take τὸ παιδίον (on account of his mystical meaning) for the *male child;* but without any reason, for it is quite general and almost the same as γέννημα, אִם יָלְדָה אֶת־הַיֶּלֶד. But the little child, however, is already *a man*, complete for future growth, as the common note of mothers' joy runs—"The blessed God hath forgotten nothing in him."[2] That a sinful *man* is born into this temporal, miserable, perverted *world*—alas, that in itself says but little; without the grace of God coming to nature's help all mothers' joy is but vain, and may be the ground of future woes, as in Eve's yet ignorant קָנִיתִי אִישׁ. Nevertheless, in the symbolical domain of nature, this joy has for the first its full propriety;

[1] There is nevertheless a pure joy which the perfectly just may feel in the righteous judgment of God, and which must not be called rejoicing in evil! (2 Thess. i. 6; Rev. xviii. 20.) Which meaning of the *Spirit* in the typical Old Testament (*e.g.* Ps. cxxxvii.) must be carefully distinguished from the human joy which might be connected with it. There may be in heaven a most glorious realisation of the true *Purim joy*, in the name of the Lord.

[2] In this mother-joy in the birth of a "man child," Braune sees still more, "The woman has the deepest and most living interest in—*humanity*.' (Our Age and its Mission, Leipzic 1850.)

God has wisely and graciously so ordered it, for the compensation of pangs and the continuance of the human race, that the mother presently *remembereth no more the anguish*, and therefore fearlessly hath her desire towards her husband still. Gen. iii. 16, אֶל־אִישֵׁךְ תְּשׁוּקָתֵךְ—whence immediately follows his lordship.

But all this, since the Fall which introduced it, is only a symbolical *prophecy*, written in nature by the finger of God, of the new birth of the true, restored man, as we have already seen in ch. iii.; no man doubts that here also the Lord speaks ἐν παροιμίᾳ, although the current interpretation of the words exhibits all variations of depth. The immediate and sudden *transition* from the greatest anguish to the most compensative joy, as in the case of the mother when she hath borne her child, and further the necessity of these woes, and their being in the fruit of them themselves turned to joy,—is a type of the corresponding spiritual process which admits of comparison with no other in the whole domain of nature. The first and fundamental *tertium comparationis*, therefore, lies in the simple word—*Your sorrow shall be turned into joy*. Further, in the spiritual fulfilment of this the same man is even both in one person,—the bearing mother and the child borne. In the Old Testament not only are the pangs of birth a frequent figure of the greatest anguish and distress generally (כַּיּוֹלֵדָה), but the similitude often presses onward into its spiritual interpretation. See Micah iv. 9, 10; Hos. xiii. 13, in the right translation and exposition; but especially the remarkable passages Is. lxvi. 7, 8 and xxvi. 17–19, into the deep meaning of which we cannot permit ourselves now to enter, but leave it to the investigation of the thoughtful reader.

Who is then the bearing one, to whom Jesus here promises joy after and out of anguish? Manifestly, in the first place, as in ver. 20 before and ver. 22 afterward it is declared—His disciples. How and when were they so troubled? (Lu. xxiv. 17.) How did the resurrection tidings astound them as they mourned and wept! (Mark xvi. 10.) And was not this sorrow concerning Christ, this passion-sympathy, actually *to them* first of all the anguish of the new birth, a divine sorrow on account of sin? We may say that what was wanting in these first disciples to the full deep penitence which must precede the reception of the

whole grace of Christ, was experienced now first in its depth during these days. In their ears also sounded the word, piercing their heart and conscience, which the Sufferer cried—Weep not for Me but for yourselves! Under the cross of their Lord they learned to *sorrow for sin*, as they had never been taught before, with full understanding and feeling:—the joy of the world showed them what the world was, and delivered them from all the dreams of a Messiah's kingdom in this world; this drove them back into the depths of their own hearts, where they found the root and essence of the same sin, and in the entire obscuration of all else it was to them as if they were themselves no better than the world, unworthy of their heavenly Friend; as if the triumphant power of sin in them had put an end to all which their faith had hitherto apprehended and hoped for. They *saw* Him no more, not even in the light of faith in remembrance! All their previous *unbelief* must become manifest to them as condensed into one whole, their *weakness* must sink into impotence and despondency. They saw and they tasted with Christ, as far as in them lay, *the sin of the world*, and they, moreover, *their own sin* in it—they were *almost* reduced to become conscious only of *sin*, without a propitiation or redemption.[1] This way from sorrow to joy was to the first disciples as the pangs of birth for the outburst of resurrection-gladness; and their way, as we shall see more plainly soon, shadowed out our way to the same result. None of us appropriates, in true personal experience, the joy of Easter and Pentecost until the passion-sorrow has first prepared the way.

But let us now penetrate still more deeply. What was all the suffering of the disciples but a fellowship with the sufferings of their Lord? Did not He first, in the deepest reality, feel in Himself that anguish on account of sin, did He not experience all the throes and pangs of death that He might, by suffering, bring forth life? He Himself in such reality that His disciples, to the end of their days, and of all time, might enter more and more fully into the fellowship of this suffering unto their full

[1] "As if there were upon earth only sinners who godlessly mocked in their sin, and sinners who wept helplessly beneath it." The author unfolded all the thoughts of this passage in the third of Zwanzig biblische Predigten, Kempten bei Dannheimer, 1832.

consummate birth into life? He who does not at last refer ver. 21 to *Christ Himself* has not yet extracted the whole meaning of the word. Thus not merely (as Dräseke says), "*With you* it will be as with a mother;" although Fikenscher truly observes that "Jesus would apply the similitude of the labouring mother only to His disciples." His express words of interpretation, that is, speak only of them; but this interpretation itself is not otherwise to be understood than as we first penetrate to the ground of the matter, and perceive how Christ in His person endures the regeneration-pangs of entire humanity. *Cross* and *new-birth* are closely connected in one, as was shown to Nicodemus at the beginning; if for us the second comes out of the first by means of the crucifying with Him of our old man, so must the Son of man, who draws us into this fellowship, Himself first have entered into a real fellowship with this old man—though without sin of His own. An intimation *of this* is already found in the fact that our Lord says here with the same emphasis—her *hour is come*—as He previously had said concerning His own sufferings; but it more certainly approves itself by a right understanding of the great matter itself.[1] The death of Christ was "the sore birth-act of entire humanity" (as Olshausen expresses himself), for humanity was in Him not merely represented *in effigie*, but essentially comprised in Him. The Messiah, suffering and scorned, bears the peoples all in His bosom,—thus is Ps. lxxxix. 50 rightly interpreted and expounded;[2] this is the seed which He has, the fruit which He bears, the עַם נוֹלָד to which the righteousness shall be declared which He hath accomplished. (Ps. xxii. 30, 31.) That which in Him is flesh of our flesh, infirmity derived from Adam's fall, becomes the vessel and instrument of redeeming sensibility to sin and experience of death, by which comes in the first breaker-through, the *great birth* of the new *man* in His person, which may be regarded as the fully born Son of God

[1] And this we would desire for Luthardt, who has adventured somewhat too early on St John's Gospel. Forgetting his earlier admission, he makes the Lord here again speak for the time beyond the death and resurrection —literally and alone concerning the new birth of the glorified church at His coming! This is exegesis which condemns itself by its utter inappropriateness for the pulpit, contradicting the Spirit who preaches in the church.

[2] See my Psalmenkommentar, which establishes this *grammatically*.

in humanity, as well as the more than reinstated heavenly man glorified in the Godhead. (1 Cor. xv. 47, 48.) Chrysostom, bordering on this mystery, refers our saying to the *ὠδῖνας τοῦ θανάτου*, Acts ii. 24, in which we must be on our guard against finding, with the superficial, an error of the Sept. for "bands." The חֶבְלֵי שְׁאוֹל, Ps. xviii. 5, the sorrow of hades, Christ has already anticipated upon the cross, so that He comes to the place, where, indeed, many will yet be born to Him, as already the living Forerunner and Conqueror.[1] In this great process of birth in death, the real prototype of the regeneration of every child of Adam which is thus made possible, He is Himself the labouring mother; but we may and we must more precisely say that the *mother* of all birth and new-birth is *the Spirit*, who at the beginning of the new-creation out of the first ruin, of light out of the darkness, wrought brooding upon the waters (Gen. i. 2 מְרַחֶפֶת),[2] who now as *πνεῦμα αἰώνιον* (Heb. ix. 14) overcomes the flesh, rends the veil of death in order to the breaking through of the God-man, previously prepared for in humanity, but now made perfect; who since then as the Spirit of the church brings to their full issue all the further pangs which produce the brethren of the First-born. Here we can speak only in the language of Theosophists and Mystics; and common theology is impatient of this, and turns away from it.

Ver. 22. The *three stages* in the experience of the disciples, which are here brought into one perspective of prophecy and yet plainly distinguished, have been brought into prominence by Beck,[3] with his wonted depth of insight into Scripture. "One feast followed another after the passion, in which *they had sorrow:* at the resurrection He *saw them again*, but (*we* would add) *they saw not Him yet* in full clearness, they had not their full joy through fear of the Jews; first at the ascension, when they saw Him go to the Father (*βλεπόντων αὐτῶν*, Acts i. 9), *their hearts rejoiced;* but this also would have vanished as a

[1] See my Reden der Apostel i. 42, and the Psalmenkom., where the whole difficulty of the distinction between חֶבְלֵי from חֶבֶל and חַבְלֵי from חֶבֶל is fully entered into.

[2] Basil. lib. 2 Hexam. *ἀνέθαλπε καὶ ζωογόνει τὴν τῶν ὑδάτων φύσιν κατὰ τὴν εἰκόνα τῆς ἐπωαζούσης ὄρνιθος*; comp. Deut. xxxii. 11.

[3] Christl. Reden ii. Band S. 63 ff.

beautiful dream if the Comforter had not assured them at the pentecost that *no man should take from them their joy*. Here also we see why now ὄψομαι stands instead of ὄψεσθε, for not only does all spring from His return in the resurrection, but *their* seeing and *beholding* will be first consummated in the Spirit as the consequence of that. That their *heart* should rejoice—is the echo of Old Testament words, as in Ps. xxii. 27 the pregnant יְחִי לְבַבְכֶם לָעַד—and still more plainly Is. lxvi. 14, καὶ ὄψεσθε, καὶ χαρήσεται ἡ καρδία ὑμῶν. This last parallel teaches us at once two things: that the last fulfilment of this promise reaches forward to the end of the church's victory, and that this joy of heart is the contrast of the world's joy turned into mourning. (Is. lxv. 13, 14.) Yes, indeed, this is a joy against which (even now) the *laughter* of the world is a *howling!*" Did the world rejoice around the cross of Christ according to ver. 20, in any such sense that their *heart* actually was glad? That could not have been, nor can it be so ever. The joy of the world is no deeper than the skin; it is a sickly spasmodic tumult in the flesh, against the feeling of the heart and the testimony of the conscience. "They laugh—but anguish is in their hearts!" It is only *because* they enter not into their hearts that they can for a while enjoy a forced satisfaction. The world which, with or without Christ, would evade the thought of sin and death, the deepest ground of all sorrow, can secure its joy only by the dissipation of its inmost nature, and by becoming deaf to its voice. Therefore its joy is *loud*, while yet silent joy is alone genuine and profound. When its gladness and mockery become silent around Golgotha, nothing remains but that all the people smite upon their breasts. The world needs *something from without* for its joy, because it has not its source within, no child of this world can rejoice alone with his God; but the children of God through Christ seek it in their hearts, and in their hearts they have salvation, their true joy. The world is satisfied without satisfaction—We lose not the hearts' peace in the midst of all the tribulation which may befall. The world misunderstands and perverts the word of Ecclus. xxx. 22–25, which the pious man intended not indeed in the sense of Wisd. ii. 6–9, but yet, being without the Spirit of inspiration, has expressed in a way easily misunderstood—It

fears and drives from it sorrow, as death! But believers understand better, according to 2 Cor. vii. 10, and resign themselves willingly to that wholesome tribulation which only increases their joy.

And still the Lord's last words are true to them—*Their* joy no man taketh away! (Mark the hint that it is otherwise with the world.) The root and principle and strength of their joy cannot be touched, however afflictions may come; for 2 Cor. i. 5 holds eternally true, and suffering with Christ *becomes* itself ever increasing consolation and joy. As long as the disciples are in the world, they do indeed need a preservation from evil; for there is danger ever present of their joy being taken away. But if they do not *themselves* fall from it and destroy their own peace, *no man* else, not the world and its princes can rob them of their once-received joy. (Just as chap. x. 28 was expounded.) The present *αἴρει*, once more,[1] has great emphasis, it embraces the whole time to come, but means finally the goal of consummate security, 1 Pet. i. 7–9. Thus the entire promise, in as far as it includes not merely the whole future life of these first disciples but the whole succession of future disciples, *extends very far*, actually even to the end of the days. This is the truth of the exposition which would be prematurely eschatological. And here we plainly perceive (preparatorily to ver. 23) what is the key to the understanding of the inmost meaning of the word, that which alone satisfies its meaning: *The way of the first disciples between the passion and pentecost is a type of the whole interval of the Lord's church between His departure to the Father and His final return.* This is to be understood according to the genius of the New Testament, where the prophetical-typical history already carries in itself the essence of its fulfilment (which in the Old Testament only *sometimes* and in a certain sense *preparatorily* is the case).

The child-bearing woman is further the church through the Spirit within her, yea, humanity itself as far as it is called, and by the Spirit also within it prepared, to become the church. Now are the many children born, like the dew of the morning-

[1] For neither *ἔξετε* nor *ἀρεῖ* is a correct reading: both originated in an ignorant emendation.

dawn; but the dawn is ever preceded by the night. That which is received and prepared in secret (Ps. cxxxix. 15) is, in *every one* who withstands not this preparation, at the right time when his hour is come, born in a first complete birth. But the new-born disciples of Christ have still much sorrow in the world, they enter through much tribulation into the kingdom of God; the whole church included as One in Christ has no other way to pass in its process through the ages. In the meanwhile, and all around it, the world rejoices on. The children of this world take their childish pleasure in natural life, in its strength, gifts, and advantages—this is the least thing, although that which in children is natural and *relatively* innocent, in the adult can be no other than folly. Great folly indeed, to be willing to pursue their undisturbed pleasures—and to be able, in as far as it is a matter of will, and there is no heart towards God and eternity! But the case is worse, for in the ground of the heart and conscience the claims of God are ever enforced, His reproving Spirit continually speaks. Thus the world rejoices not only *without* God but *against* God; it rejoices wilfully *in sin*, makes that its pleasure, which should be the ground of all true and salutary sorrow. Then cometh the Christ, whom the Spirit preaches, across its path—and the world despises and crucifies Him in His members, rejoices in an imaginary victory over Him; and that is, in the awful fulfilment of the first type, the lying Passover and perverted Purim which our modern pseudo-Christendom, with its babbling about its own God and its own "redemption," celebrates.

But he who—and he *alone* who can no longer rejoice with this world, finds imperishable joy, and that ever more increasing in the way through true sorrow. If we are found in this way of true discipleship we *cannot idly enjoy* this life, for we have learned with the Preacher the vanity of all things earthly, and the dread solemnity of death and judgment. We say to the laughter, which dances on the edge of the abyss, It is mad; and to the mirth, which prepares for itself eternal anguish, What doeth it? (Eccles. ii. 2.) We have known and felt, yea, we know and feel in more and more entire crucifixion with Christ, our own sinfulness and sin; and if in this our sorrow, as we hang upon the cross, the world in mocking sympathy

would reach to us its deadening potion, we put it from us as our Lord did. All worldly consolation is a mockery and horror, in all worldly joy we taste the bitterness of sin. Therefore we also mourn and weep, as our Lord did over Jerusalem, over the sin and blindness of the world, in the spirit of His members and brethren, Ps. xxxv. 12–14. Those who are marked with the ת of the cross sigh and cry for all the abominations that be done in the midst of Jerusalem, Ezek. ix. 4. And in this last sense we have much distress, that *we see not Jesus.*[1] Nevertheless, with all the ever-recurring affliction[2] of His people, there is ever recurring also for His church and every individual member of it the Easter and the Pentecost, witnessed by constant external and internal victories, in which the Living One sees us again and quickens us; infuses into our hearts new joy through His Spirit, a joy which finally no man can take away. As the sum of all: Every disciple of Jesus through his entire life, the church of Christ as a whole down to the end of the days, learns and experiences in the cross of Christ that true sorrow which genders *joy*, receives and enjoys *this* as the fruit of the resurrection and Pentecost in a progressive measure ever approaching perfection—until the great day dawns which will be followed by no night, because light and darkness, the new heavenly humanity and the humanity which is lost, will have then been sundered for ever through the throes of the Spirit which continue through the ages, and bring that to perfection in the church which Christ brought to perfection in Himself.

Vers. 23, 24. When, in immediate connection with what has just been said, we find the *greatest* promise connected with the strikingly prominent ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ—it becomes needful to

[1] "Yea, the Christian grieves that he *does not find* Jesus, whom he would fain meet everywhere, in so many ages and in so many places, in so many men and in so many families, in so many circumstances and in so many solemn offices. It irks him sore that he seeks Him in vain without whom there is no truth, no life, no peace, in so many books, churches, sermons, songs, and prayers!" Brandt's Predigtbuch zu Jubilate.

[2] For every new generation of men must undergo this pang of birth, the same transition from sorrow to joy, which is by no means the result of our "weakness of faith." (This against Schleiermacher, who will evade the strict reference of this to every individual! Homil. ii. 533.)

mark carefully the meaning of this formula. It is obvious that it cannot mean any actual individual *day;* and we cannot avoid seeing that the *time* signified by it *begins* with the day of the resurrection, if we have rightly understood that the great turning-point of the Future, which our Lord since ch. xiv. 3 has had always before His eyes, has its commencement in the resurrection morning after the night of suffering and death. The same form of expression is used to signify this in ch. xiv. 20. But as certainly as we have seen embraced in vers. 20–22 a comprehensive glance at all the future of the church, must we, in this connected but heightened conclusion of all, give the words their furthest reach of signification. The Lord, as we think at least, intends this ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ, corresponding with the prophetic בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא, first of all to include the whole period of the dispensation of the Spirit, which already typically commenced in His first return and seeing them again;—and then pre-eminently the *end* of this time, the *consummation of the fulness of the Spirit* in His own, when He shall have unfolded and imparted all that is Christ's to His people. This is plain from the greatness of the promise connected with it, which can never have its full realisation till that goal is reached. And in that day *ye shall ask Me nothing!* Great and unfathomable word! The ancient expositors, finding that αἰτεῖν is subsequently spoken of, would take ἐρωτᾷν in the same sense of *putting a request;*[1] Grotius, and after him B.-Crusius, repeats this, the latter asserting that "ἐρωτᾷν as in ver. 26 is that referred to an *individual* matter which αἰτεῖσθαι is in *general.*" But ver. 26 is far from being as decisive as that in ver. 19 ἐρωτᾷν is *questioning* and so recurs in ver. 30:—the necessity of asking, as abolished through consummated knowledge in the light and life of the Spirit, is evidently the fundamental idea. It may be remarked that as both meanings are included in the one Heb. שׁאל, the ideas of begging and questioning pass one into the other; hence Theophylact more correctly afterward, and Augustin, admit both senses in the word. We shall see how much truth there is in this; and now holding to the main idea obviously indicated, we would *ask* ourselves, long after Pentecost, whether we have reached such a point

[1] So Chrys., Theophyl., Theod. Mops., Theod. Heracl., and others.

that we have *nothing more* (οὐκ—οὐδέν) actually to inquire about? Whether the Apostles themselves reached that point even in *their* life? Augustin says, We hear the Lord Christ inquired of, after He had risen. The last question at the ascension, Acts i. 6, is inquiring enough, and is even repelled by being referred to the far futurity. It is true, indeed, that a not asking through joy and contentment is here promised, even as in ver. 5 the not asking through sorrow was blamed; it is nevertheless wrong to restrict this strongly emphasized word to mean merely, Ye shall not ask concerning that which I now speak of, ye shall not despondingly ask about My going away. (Theophyl.: οὐδὲν τοιοῦτον οἷον καὶ πρώην· ποῦ ὑπάγεις;) For the ποῦ ὑπάγεις, which the Lord desired in ver. 5, was not the questioning of sorrowful perplexity, but the true inquiry of spiritual intelligence; when therefore He now speaks of "asking *nothing* more," He can mean only the consummate satisfaction both of knowledge and of experience (which always go together). (Theoph. afterward correcting himself, says, πάντα γὰρ γνώσεσθε ἐν πνεύματι.) Had the disciples reached this point at the day of Pentecost? Did not the Spirit lead them by degrees into all truth? And lead them, too, through the instrumentality of this further prayer for increasing light and power of life in the Spirit? And is not *praying* also a kind of *asking*?[1] We find, indeed, in ver. 26 an αἰτήσεσθε connected with the ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ, but this contradiction is only thus to be explained, that there the entire period of the dispensation of the Spirit is referred to, while here in ver. 23 it is specially its goal and end. The way to no more supplicating and no more questioning, is to supplicate and question all the more diligently till that day comes:—that is the connection in which ver. 23 is continued.

This connection, however, is very generally misunderstood. Even Meyer restricts the not asking, as if their praying nevertheless was altogether parallel and simultaneous, when he remarks, "Ye shall be able then with all your *doubts*, etc., to turn directly to heaven, ye shall need My *visible presence* in the flesh no more." Just as Neander, "They should then need His sensible presence no longer, the Father Himself would impart to

[1] "Thus all asking will not cease, since every petition is also an inquiry." V. Gerlach.

them all things." Grotius, similarly, "The ἐμέ preceding seems to prove that this member is to be opposed to what follows. The disciples were troubled, because they would not then have Jesus *present*." Nor otherwise Bengel, Ye shall apply to the Father Himself. And that with the dismissal of all desire for the visible presence of Jesus.[1] Origen pressed this so far as to deduce from the imaginary antithesis between ἐμέ and τὸν πατέρα the inference that prayer should not be directed to the Son. (de Orat. § 50.) But we need only to push the thought to this its extreme point, and its incorrectness immediately appears. It would be altogether out of harmony with the fundamental idea of these last discourses, that Jesus should thus place His own person in opposition to the Father (or even to the Spirit). It is obvious that then first do His disciples pray to or ask of *Him* aright, when they pray to the Father or inquire of the Spirit. (And we do not find with the αἰτεῖτε a second time τὸν πατέρα expressly added, just as we do not in ch. xiv.—and this is here of more significance!) Thus the emphasis does not lie upon the ἐμέ, but on the strong οὐκ ἐρωτήσετε οὐδέν, the full meaning of which must not be impaired. In ch. xiv. 20 perfect *knowledge* was promised; but in this passage that consummation comes into more decided prominence, as the proper and final goal of all. We were right, consequently, in asserting at the outset that the promise of the *coming again* in these chapters embraces all that may come under that idea in one great perspective, extending finally *to that great day*;[2] we see here how that assertion approves itself, and how most appropriate it was that these farewell discourses for His then present and

[1] Similarly Fikenscher, "The emphasis is on the word *Me*. The disciples should no longer ask Jesus, but His *Spirit*—then would all curious, spiritless, anxious, carnal questioning cease."

[2] Kling reaches the same result, and finds here in Jno. xiv.–xvi. "that *the Parousia of Christ in a wider sense rules all*, there is a continuous revelation, a continuous coming and making Himself present—which, however, is in a more marked and decisive manner evidenced at the great epochs of the history of the kingdom of God, and at the turning-points of its development." (Rheinische Monatsch. 1846.) He rightly places Matt. xxviii. 20 by the side of Jno. xiv.–xvi. as the ground-text of eschatology, but we would add that the "until" is not wanting even in St John; we have it in ch. xvi. 22, 23.

future disciples should have so extensive a reach. The ὄψομαι ὑμᾶς here in ver. 22 is, in its general meaning for the church still from age to age pursuing the way of the cross, the same final and absolute return which we found in the beginning at ch. xiv. 3:—to the individual when he is taken home in death, to the whole body at the Parousia which we wait for. Thus the end falls back into and coincides with the beginning.

In the eternal glory, which will be the final issue of all temporal adversity, "all our past doubts will be solved, all our complaints silenced, and *all our questioning answered* for ever; then will be fully accomplished the saying, And in that day ye shall ask Me nothing more; that is, ye shall know and understand all, ye shall look through the whole way through your sorrows past into eternal joy, the whole way through the world of your tribulation unto Me who overcame the world."[1] Dietz, after discoursing upon our bias to *ask* unseasonable questions in our affliction, says, "But *one day* in that world He will, in a manner beyond all comprehension of ours, justify Himself for all; He will make it clear to our eyes that His ways were altogether goodness and truth.[2] And *then* shall we ask Him no more." And in the same manner speaks Luther in his Jubilate-sermon, where, doing full justice to the understanding given by the Spirit, he asserts notwithstanding, "But *in this present life* nothing is to be fundamentally and fully understood." These are thoughts which a preacher applying the words to the congregation cannot avoid deducing, and this homiletic exegesis must approve itself to be the sole perfect interpretation. Do *we* now carry our thoughts upon the Lord's promise further than He Himself carried them? Storr, bound by his false grammatical-historical exegesis, asks nevertheless with all simplicity, "May we not also apply to the final goal of hope which Jesus had set

[1] As many years ago I expounded it in the sermon quoted before.

[2] Then will the fulfilment go beyond the figure of the woman in labour, since the *no more remembering the anguish* will be fulfilled in heaven, and yet *not* fulfilled. In nature, as in the beginnings of grace, we must forget the anguish in order to be happy; but the pangs of the passion and new birth of the soul will be an eternal memorial to the honour of God, whose spiritual working they proclaim; and in heaven first will the anguish itself become joy. The remembrance of penitence and chastisement, and therefore of the sin which needed them, will not interrupt but heighten our happiness.

before His Apostles, and of which His visit after His death was the seal, that which He spoke concerning the time when they should at His resurrection see Him again—In that day ye shall ask Me nothing? Will it not indeed be pre-eminently true of *that* period when we shall be with Jesus in His Father's house, beholding His visible glory for ever, that then we shall need to ask no more?" But what right should we have to push the meaning of our Lord's words so far beyond the meaning in which He is supposed to have used them? The solution of the whole lies here, that He spoke this *οὐκ ἐρωτήσετε οὐδέν* concerning the day of resurrection or pentecost, *only in as far as* that introductory day was the starting-point and *type of the perfect day of the Spirit*, and in its strict literalness only of the consummation and close of this latter.

Our way to heaven, also, in the following and fellowship of Jesus in His way through sorrow to the Father, is conducting us to this same end, the perfect issues of this great birth. Jesus is still continually giving us His pledge that we shall in a little while see Him again; the difference is only this, that now the day has already dawned, the access is open wide, inasmuch as true asking and praying presently finds hearing and answer, and faith having the earnest of the Spirit has the victory of the future already in anticipation. Jesus takes His farewell of the disciples in the word which we shall hear in ver. 33; thus there is as yet no perfect joy and satisfaction, there is still the interchange of anxiety and confidence, of dying and living (2 Cor. vi. 9, 10) —after the forgotten pangs of travail new tribulation—after the *I believe! I know!* many a new doubt and mystery. And on this account our Lord, after having pointed to the final goal, continues His encouragement in the way thus—But now, in the bright hope of that great day, *ask and pray as ye have never done before!*

The *Ἀμὴν ἀμήν* which commences this gracious encouragement has misled many, as in the church pericopes (where it might be justified), so also in exposition, to begin a new section with this *Verily*. Luther: "He has now ended the sermon, and told the disciples all they were to know. He will now close; and gives a final encouragement to prayer." But this disturbs the compact connection—Till then pray on! and the new and

closing section is indicated plainly in ver. 25 by the ταῦτα λελάληκα. The Lord simply repeats here what He had said in ch. xiv. 13, 14; and we must refer thither for the exposition of praying *in His name*, and of the universality of the promise (here ὅσα ἂν—). Hitherto ye have asked nothing in My name—this is not a "reproof" (as Braune and Rieger think), but confirms our exposition in ch. xiv., of what this praying *in the name of Jesus* properly is. Such prayer had not been possible to any even the highest saints and petitioners, not to the disciples themselves, before Jesus was glorified. The Lord's Prayer itself became then a great truth to the disciples, when they came to know that Jesus had gone from them to the Father, and for what end He had gone. "This manner of prayer generally had never yet been known among the saints upon earth—it announces itself as something altogether *new*.[1] As in the Old-Testament way of holiness the problem had ever been to learn better how to *pray*, so also *we* have in the practice of prayer in the name of Jesus the only way of progress toward perfect holiness, knowledge, and joy of heart. All the discourses, exhortations, encouragements of our Lord find their ultimate aim in directing us to perfect prayer: *therefore* we have this word of the beginning of the discourse, which stands also in the middle of it, ch. xv. 7, recurring with all its emphasis at the close. Αἰτεῖτε—this *imperative* of the Sermon on the Mount, now illustrated and strengthened by *in My name*, is uttered here at the farewell with the utmost graciousness. It is the most benevolent permission, as well as the most solemn and urgent commandment, of Him whose desire is our *joy*. Ask, so shall ye *receive!* Many alas who only half pray, and do not urge their knocking even to pressing in, cannot afterward *receive* even what they have prayed for! But persistent prayer "obtains for me the blessing that I can receive and appropriate that which the Father gives. I actually obtain the

[1] In Krummacher's Elias iii. S. 85–102, there is an episode on praying in the name of Jesus which gives the truth beautifully, but in too paradoxical expression. Thus, when it is said with strong emphasis that it is equal to our standing in the place of Jesus, we miss the befitting counterpart—rather Jesus standing in ours. And the *substance* of our prayer is indeed presupposed, but not adequately expressed,—that we must pray only as touching the kingdom of God, and for everything else as subject to its conditions.

hand which enables me to lay hold of and receive the heavenly gifts." (C. K. Rieger.) Only in this way will His joy in us, even as our own finally, become full, πεπληρωμένη, so that nothing more shall be wanting to us! See ch. xv. 11, and mark now the goal to which ver. 22 pointed.[1] The world has its vain, sinful, distracted, enforced joy over the abyss into which it is plunging; and that it cannot pray, either in joy or in the tribulations which already give their warning, is its true misery and the beginning of its judgment. But the disciples of Jesus *pray* themselves in the way of the cross even into heaven, where they finally have their full fruition. Then will they see Him, whom, having not seen, they love, and have believed in; but the faith, which looks to this end, must, during the whole progress of the way, rightly understand and joyfully appropriate the word of the true Comforter— *Yet a little while* and ye shall *see* Me, for I will come to take you to the Father where I am, I will return to fetch you home.

FINAL REFERENCE TO THE GREAT FUTURE: NOW IN PARABLE, THEN OPENLY: THE LOVE AND FAITH OF THE DISCIPLES IN MUCH WEAKNESS; LAST CONSOLATION DERIVED FROM HIS OVERCOMING THE WORLD.

(Ch. xvi. 25–33.)

Ver. 25 opens the final winding up of these discourses to the disciples, the proper conclusion of the whole, rounded by "*these things have I said unto you*" both at its beginning and end. In a last reference to their future understanding the Lord declares emphatically all His previous sayings to have been obscure, to be as yet—not so much unintelligible in themselves (for how could He ever so speak?)—as not understood by the disciples. The reason of this is twofold. As no prophetic word can be properly and fully understood before its actual fulfilment, so here—When the things of which He had spoken shall come to pass, the veil of obscurity will fall from His mysterious words.

[1] "Until ye obtain *all things* and have your full joy; which prayer will be first fulfilled on the last day." (Luther.)

Nevertheless, the blessed disciples would have understood at least much more than they did, if the veil had not been upon their hearts and minds. Yea, they *believed in* Him and *loved* Him, as He graciously and solemnly testifies here; but their faith is so little based upon knowledge, their love is still so weak, that He is constrained to connect with this the fore-announcement of their immediately impending σκορπίζεσθαι εἰς τὰ ἴδια. His concluding address, therefore, resolves itself, as we said in the introductory analysis, into three parts. In vers. 25–28 He consoles them, while He, without any questioning or suggestion of theirs, alludes to the feeling of His words' mysteriousness which filled their minds, by the promise of a future ἀναγγέλλειν παῤῥησίᾳ[1] from which will follow their asking and receiving unto fulness of joy; yea, He goes so far as to assure them, for the sake of the love and faith, which they already have, of the especial love of the Father, and to seal this again in ver. 28 by the plainest recognition of their faith in His having come forth from God.—But when the simple disciples prematurely suppose, thereby revealing their ignorance, that they already understand Him, and regard this as the promised future enlightenment, asserting their weak confused *we believe* with an emphatic *by this*—He is constrained in vers. 31, 32 to answer, It is true that ye do believe, but how soon will My passion make manifest your real and great weakness! And now He is come to the very threshold of the hour, He can say no more but must let it come, that it may bring all things with it and make all things plain; He therefore breaks off abruptly with a final *word of encouragement and victory* which merges all the anxiety of His present and future disciples (not forgotten even here!) into the *peace* which He bequeathes and promises, the foundation of that peace being *His own victory*, anticipated before the conflict in perfect faith. Finally, to witness and seal the *I have overcome* there remains nothing more than the *prayer* to the Father who glorifieth Him and whom He glorifieth.

Ver. 25. *Παροιμία* is, in common Greek, as we all know, a *proverb*, a common current word, which not only—as in the proverbs of all nations—sets forth a general truth and often

[1] For we read ἀναγγελῶ here also, after vers. 13, 14, 15, and not, with Tisch. and Lach. ἀπαγγελῶ—of which more anon.

recurring fact in a figurative form, but also in this figurativeness intimates a teaching—wise or the reverse—which is not at once manifest.[1] In oriental scriptural phraseology it appears still more plain that every *παροιμιῶδες* is also *αἰνιγματῶδες*. And we know the pregnant meaning of the Hebrew מָשָׁל, for which the Sept. not only in the superscription of Solomon's sentences, but frequently elsewhere (*e.g.* 1 Sam. x. 12; Ezek. xviii. 2), has *παροιμία*. In Sirach it is the common expression for the sentences of the wise which are to be pondered—ch. vi. 35, *παροιμίαι συνέσεως*—ch. viii. 8—xlvii. 17, *παροιμίαις καὶ παραβολαῖς*—ch. xxxix. 3, *ἀπόκρυφα παροιμιῶν, ἐν αἰνίγμασι παραβολῶν*. When the Lord here says that He had spoken *ἐν παροιμίαις*, He presupposes first (what is generally overlooked) that He, Himself the truth and more than Solomon, could not do otherwise than speak in sentences full of deep meaning; but then He makes prominent the mysteriousness, unintelligible to the disciples, of His sayings, as the *opposite παῤῥησία* immediately shows. Further, His *ταῦτα λελάληκα* refers not merely to what had directly preceded, but first to the whole of the farewell discourses, and then further back and more generally to all His sayings. We must not adhere too closely (in opposition to the whole scriptural usage as derived from the Old Testament) to the specific signification *proverb*, *parable*, or *similitude*, as if only such were meant in the *παροιμίαι* as that of the shepherd in ch. x. 6. It is true that since ch. xiv. 1 there has been much proverbial, parabolical, figurative expression;—the woman in child-birth, the friends and the servants, the vine; and, besides these, even the way, the house, the dwellings, yea even the official name of the Spirit, *παράκλητος*.[2] But has there not

[1] The derivation from *παρά* and *οἶμος*, *οἴμη*, the way, is certain, but the signification not so plain. Most probably—obvia usuque trita formula dicendi. Not derived from the sentences which have been set up as waymarks—as some have artificially supposed. Thus, not in the etymology, but in the thing itself, for which the word was originated, lies the further idea that it is (as Lampe cites a definition)—*λόγος ἐπικαλύπτων τὸ σαφὲς ἀσαφείᾳ ἢ δι' αἰσθητῶν πραγμάτων σημαίνων πράγματα νοητά, ἢ ἐπικεκρυμμένην τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἐπεμφαίνων.*

[2] The remark of Hess as it respects this last is very acute, that in the Acts and the Epistles this figurative expression is no longer found, because the then present Comforter is known and experienced as the *Spirit*. Else-

been as much or even more plain literal discourse interposed, in the *form* of which there has been nothing mysterious or concealed? And yet all this must be included in *these things!* We must consequently regard two things as established in this still figurative sentence:—that "*in proverbs*" indicates obscurity generally, and that the ground of it was specially in the disciples themselves. When in Ezekiel the third great period of prophecy began,[1] in which prophecy assumed its clearest form, as literally plain as was then possible and fit, Ezekiel—who unites in himself as it were the more plain Jeremiah and the most obscure Daniel—gives always the interpretation of his visions and similitudes, even as afterwards Zechariah did. Nevertheless they say of him (so that he finally spoke in plainer terms)—הֲלֹא מְמַשֵּׁל מְשָׁלִים הוּא, ch. xxi. 5 (xx. 49). In the same sense all that which the Lord had now spoken so clearly remains to the disciples, ἐν παροιμίαις (for which the Heb. N. T. should rather have put בְּמְשָׁלִים than בְּחִידוֹת); and concerning His plainest words they say—*we know not what He saith.* This is the meaning of the Lord, by which He disclosed their thought and laid bare their darkness, as they afterwards, ver. 30, acknowledge. Thus Glassius is not to be despised here, when he remarks:—The ἐν παροιμίαις is to be understood here φαινομένως, putatively, *res pro rei opinione*—only that this not understanding of the disciples has itself an objective ground in the futurition of the things spoken of. The Lord also had expounded His parables to the disciples, as Ezekiel to all the people, had commended their seeing eyes and hearing ears, had graciously imputed to them an understanding of the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven. (Mark iv. 34; Matt. xiii. 11, 16.) But in that higher degree of contrast with a true understanding which the εὐαγγέλιον πνευματικόν discloses, those expositions themselves, equally with the plainest

where we find, *e.g.*, in the letters of the churches of Lyons and Vienne (Euseb. v. 1), that a martyr had ἐν ἑαυτῷ τὸν παράκλητον.

[1] The first was the directly historical prophecy from Jacob's blessing downward, culminating in Samuel's predictions; the second introduces the *typical* cycle, which rests upon 2 Sam. vii., develops itself through the Psalms and Prophets, and conclusively in Jeremiah and Daniel. Compare my Isaiah, Introduction, S. 21–30.

words (see Lu. xviii. 34), remained even to the disciples pure parable, which yet waited for its interpretation.

The ἔρχεται ὥρα which follows appears to lose its strict connection through the ἀλλά, which is at least an uncertain reading, and inserted simply for the sake of a superficial meaning. It should be either καὶ ἔρχεται (which also may be a mere interpolation), or, as we prefer, the plain unconnected ἔρχεται. This best corresponds with the Lord's meaning, in which the consolation was intended to follow directly, and so far quite parallel with the former clause as in *both* sentences something real and necessary in the process of the matter was to be announced. They might even be connected by γάρ—All that has been hitherto said must necessarily have been obscure before the day of the Spirit, *for* this will first *come* in order to your understanding! Then the soothing and reassuring promise is found already bound up in the former clause. We see that παῤῥησίᾳ, or ἐν παῤῥησίᾳ, proceeding first from confidence in the speaker (ch. vii. 13, 26), indicates further generally that which is disclosed and open, as in Mark viii. 32, Col. ii. 15, and in other passages of this gospel, ch. vii. 4, x. 24, xi. 14, 54. Lachm. and Tisch. would read ἀπαγγελῶ instead of ἀναγγελῶ, which however in the Synoptics as well as in St John, ch. iv. 51, xx. 18, has reference rather to external reports; the ἀναγγέλλειν is more in St John's style, and here reminds of ch. xvi. 13, etc.: The Lord Himself will do it, in that the Spirit doeth it. Compare also for the emphasis of the word the Samaritan woman's expectation—ἀναγγελεῖ ἡμῖν πάντα, ch. iv. 25. We cannot see how, as Lücke thinks, there is a παροιμία in the Lord's describing the Spirit's communication as His own; this interchange of the expression throughout these chapters (now —I myself; now—the Spirit), contains rather a profound truth, as we have already seen. Does not the Lord most actually and essentially come and speak *Himself* in the Spirit, with whom He is one?

Περὶ τοῦ πατρός has been understood in two ways: either as equivalent to τὰ περί, the counsels of the Father;[1] or, specifically (according to ch. xiv. 20), concerning the Father as

[1] Grotius: What is the Father's will touching My kingdom, and what things ye ought to pray for from Him.

Mine, that I am and how I am in and from the Father, and the Father in Me. But there is no dilemma here; the two are indissolubly one, the former being wrapped up in the latter alone. The final and full revelation of the New Testament through the Son in the Spirit terminates in what could never, properly speaking, be plainly revealed in the Old Testament—that there is a *Father* in the Godhead. And thus, inasmuch as we penetrate through the Son to the otherwise hidden primal principle of the Father-God, this is the most emphatic and perfect note of His full revelation—*περὶ τοῦ πατρὸς ἀναγγελῶ*; and Lücke with great propriety compares ch. xvii. 6, I have manifested *Thy name.*

But when came *the hour* which the Lord here promises? Assuredly not first at that end of the day to which ver. 23 especially pointed, for *ὥρα* must indicate a specific time within the bounds of that day. Thus it is the *first* hour of it, the dawn in which the day is actually come; and because it is come, ver. 26, returning back from the end in *οὐκ ἐρωτᾷν οὐδέν* to the *αἰτεῖν* which leads to that end, speaks again of *ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ.* Nevertheless, the "coming" hour is especially the beginning, and that as opposed to a preceding *hour* of distraction, anxiety, and obscuration of faith, of which ver. 32 speaks designedly with the same expression. The two hours are altogether the same, as we find them described in juxtaposition in ver. 16; consequently, what was there said concerning the *terminus a quo* for the seeing and knowing of the disciples, holds good here. The great transition begins in the *resurrection,* and during the forty days the Lord can already speak to them *παῤῥησίᾳ of the kingdom of God,* and open their understandings to comprehend the Scripture and His discourses as they had not been opened before; but it is *the Spirit* who brings the completion and sets the seal upon all. Even at the end of the forty days (as the last veil upon the Apostles' minds shows, Acts i. 6), the *promise* of the Holy Spirit was yet pending, and what Luther says was true: "That which I now tell you in *bodily presence,* I will by the Spirit illustrate and speak openly, so that ye shall apprehend the Father, and what My going to Him is,—that I sit at His right hand as your Representative and Intercessor, that all things have come to pass in Me in order to

your being able to come *to the Father* also." Yes, verily, *of the Father*, that He through Me is yours also, and ye His beloved children who have free access to His presence—this also is plainly included in the simple *τοῦ πατρός*, which from this time is the only expression used, vers. 26–28 and again ver. 32.

When the Romanists bring ver. 25 to support their prominent doctrine of the "obscurity of Holy Scripture," they are guilty of the folly of either disowning the free and living administration of the Spirit in connection with it, or of digging a channel for the Spirit in ecclesiastical tradition and authority. Does not the Lord promise here, when He is speaking of that obscurity, the coming of clear light, and that for all His disciples, for every inquiring and praying mind, without any further instrumentality?—When Olshausen somewhat restricts the fulness of the promise by saying, "But it may be asserted that *human language generally is a παροιμία*, since it can never be adequate fully to express Divine things," he is so far right as his meaning is that of the Apostle in 1 Cor. xiii. 12. The figurativeness of all human speech in bringing Divine things into human relations, must be conceded with its proper limitations; and consequently the imperfection (*δι' ἐσόπτρου ἐν αἰνίγματι*) of all our thoughts and notions as bound down to human language; even the apostolical words and writings, in which the Spirit speaks, retain their מְשָׁלִים into which we with the Apostles themselves desire to look, not attaining to that immediate contemplation which is reserved for eternity. But the *ἀναγγέλλειν*, which is *internal* in the Spirit (not *λαλεῖν* again) is something very different from the *expression* of what it deals with. Nor is it as if the Lord "were *opposing* to the use of this weak medium (human speech) the promise of the interposition of a more internal and essential medium"—for the speech of the Spirit is as speech perfect and strong, as in itself the *λαλεῖν* of the Lord had already been, but *there comes with it and in addition to it* the *internal opening* of the essential understanding which can indeed never be represented in word. He who speaketh in the Spirit knows and means more than the letter can express; yet the letter again is perfect to this end, that all who hear *the Spirit* may thereby receive the true know-

ledge; it expresses even more than may as yet be developed in the personal consciousness of him who is thus moved by the Spirit. But the knowledge given by the Spirit is and must ever be,—albeit only approximately in gradual progression reaching to the final goal,—in reality, and *in as far as* it is a living union with the object of that knowledge, perfect knowledge, a *continuous* explanation of all *παροιμία*, which every *λαλία* in human words, even that of the Spirit, must always contain for the limited understanding of man.

Vers. 26, 27. The state of perfection which knows no need is not yet; there is still the asking, and yet it is the *same day*. When the end of that day is reached, in which it will melt into the fulness of eternity, into perfect light and life, then indeed there will be no more asking. Now in the meantime the growing *knowledge* of the *Father* of Jesus Christ as our Father leads ever more deeply into *prayer;* but the exercise and experience of prayer requires again that knowledge. The first prayer of all, which follows, and is prompted by the all-attractive, never exhausted "Our Father," seeks the hallowing of His name, a more perfect and more living knowledge of it than is already possessed. But at the same time, inasmuch as through the Spirit in Christ every promise of God is already Yea and Amen, the first invocation anticipates the last glorying of praise:—we seal every prayer with a doxology reaching forth, in confident and tranquil trust, toward the future eternity; and thus it is already the same *day* in the light of which we ask and receive the answer, we pray and receive.

When the Lord first spoke of praying in the name of Jesus, ch. xiv., He attributed to Himself the hearing of the prayer, when He should be with the Father, expressly saying twice—*I will do it!* The same is obviously presupposed here, and by no means retracted. Similarly, it was then said concerning the all comprehending, highest gift which could be prayed for from the Father (Lu. xi. 13), the Holy Spirit, I will pray the Father for Him on your behalf,—and with an *ἐρωτήσω* which must be rigorously distinguished from our *αἰτεῖν*. Can we suppose *this* mediating intercession of the Son not to be here presupposed, and that word concerning it to be *retracted?* This cannot be thought of, and something else consistent with the former words

must be meant by the saying, καὶ οὐ λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι ἐγὼ ἐρωτήσω. Still more! The abiding intercession and mediation of the Lord, as it includes this *in My name*, is not only the constant doctrine of Scripture (Rom. viii. 34; Heb. vii. 25; 1 Jno. ii. 1) —but we have *here* immediately afterwards His prayer, emphatically for His own, Ἐγὼ περὶ αὐτῶν ἐρωτῶ! (Ch. xvii. 9.) All this has very justly moved the expositors to modify the negation of the ἐρωτᾷν περὶ ὑμῶν, and to explain it as only a relative denial. But *how* are we to understand this? Many, from the earliest times down to the present, have laid stress upon the circumstance that it is not simply οὐκ ἐρωτήσω, but merely οὐ λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι, and this would mean, I will not once more declare this, it is understood of itself. Similarly Grotius: I pass by that, as less important than that which I would *now* infer from it. Most plainly, however, the Hirsch. Bibel: "I will not repeat what I have already promised you for your encouragement, that I, etc. It is spoken as when one scarcely touches, but passes over a thing which is already certain enough, in order to impress all the more vividly another equally important principle and argument." Kuinoel has put it most strongly, *ut taceam;* and Seiler translates, I will not now say anything about the fact that—I will. But this οὐ λέγω is manifestly no mere *ut taceam*, taking for granted; the Lord does expressly touch the subject, not simply to introduce *another* argument to persuade them of their *being heard*, but the γάρ actually gives a *reason* for the earnestly meant οὐκ ἐρωτήσω, and consequently there must be in it a positive, if also a relative, truth. And the interpretation thus indicated says *too little*, and does not extend to the proper meaning of the words. On the other hand, Bengel, forgetting for a moment the other words of Jesus and writings of the Spirit, says far *too much* when he briefly points to οὐ λέγω, 1 Jno. v. 16, where *non-dico* is regarded as simply standing for *dico-non*. How then are we to solve it, so as to understand in what sense Jesus at once prays for the disciples, and prays for them not? The solution, the intimation of the *specific sense* in which the *negation* is here to be understood, is found partly in the αὐτὸς ὁ πατὴρ φιλεῖ and partly in the φιλεῖ ὑμᾶς. When the Lord in ch. v. 45 testified by the strong affirmation μὴ δοκεῖτε that *He* would not *accuse* the un-

believers to the Father, that was absolutely and literally meant; when He on the other hand here denies a certain *intercession* for those who already believe on Him, and already pray, it is His design first to repel generally a false notion concerning the Father, who requires first to be prayed unto, and then to distinguish between two kinds of intercession.

Αὐτὸς γὰρ ὁ πατήρ—that is, suâ sponte, proprio motu, *αὐτόματος*, or as Nonnus has it, *αὐτοκέλευτος*. This word therefore (oh that all preachers and theologians would understand it well!) most decisively overturns that false notion concerning the entire work of redemption which the writer will ever contend against and exhibit as *unscriptural*—that notion which attributes to the Father a wrath which is to be extinguished, and not also that reconciling love which from eternity needed not first to be propitiated. See ch. iii. 16, and what was said there. This great and gloomy misunderstanding pursues many believers into their *prayers*, hangs upon the best too often, and prevents them from entering into the full confidence and gladness of praying to the Father in the name of Jesus. Theirs is that frequent prayer, of which Krummacher says, "I regard the Father as still strange, alienated, and far off, *myself* as *shielded* through Christ from His *wrath*. I remain standing in fear before the gate of God, and *anxiously put forward my guarantee*, because I am still affrighted before Him. The feeling of my guilt, and of the holiness of God, outweighs all in my soul, not that of my *justification* before Him and His *love*." Such is, indeed, too often, but such should not be, the case! The Lord Christ with His atoning sacrifice has not interposed "like a screen or a lightning-conductor" between us and the wrathful Father; even those who come to Him in their first repentance should not think so, much less believers and the redeemed. Else would the Father be hidden and disguised by Christ, instead of being revealed; His honour would be lowered and placed *beneath* that of the loving Son, if He Himself, who sent and gave the Son, made Him for us a *ἱλαστήριον*, *loved* us not and were not *love itself!* But the "*righteous* Father" (ch. xvii. 25) does Himself love, and the world's knowing Him not consists most in this, that it is ignorant how entirely He is in Christ a Father and full of love.

Christians who believe, to whom Christ has revealed this in all its clearness, cannot too often be reminded of this: "think not too little of the love wherewith *ye* are loved!" Not merely has the Father Himself already loved them as He loves all the world and every creature, but He loves *them* with that *especial* love which He bears to those in whom He finds Christ's word, and through faith in it Christ Himself, who stand before Him clothed in the garment of the righteousness of His Son. It was of this that ch. xiv. 21 spoke. We may and we ought to approach confidently to the *Father* Himself, and through the mediating work in which we stand *immediately* pray; learning better and better to repeat after our great Pattern in the flesh the *Abba* which He uttered before the rending of the veil, which to Him was yet no veil. The Father-heart, full of eternal Divine love, is open to us; how should *that* impel and allure us confidently and in the fulness of assurance to pray; deriving from this saying all that our hearts want even unto their perfect joy! But what then are we to say of the intercession of Jesus, which is maintained elsewhere, but here in some sense denied? We may say with propriety (as our Lord Himself, in ch. xvii. 9, establishes the distinction), that the first intercession of Jesus which paves the way, opens the door, to those who come to Him from the world and through Him to God (Heb. vii. 25), is something quite different, and that *this*[1] is indeed no longer necessary to those who have already come. V. Gerlach says well and clearly, "There needed no constant renewal of the mediation of Christ in order to the *establishment* of their relation to the Father; they had become once for all children of God through faith." Luther: "This faith brings us to the Father, and then all goes on in His name. Here, then, we are assured that Christ needs no longer thus to pray for us, *since He has prevailed in prayer for us already;* we may, ourselves, through Christ, urge our way in and pray. For we have no need of another Christ who shall pray for our access; this one Christ is enough, who has pre-

[1] According to Lampe: per quam adhuc viam ad Patrem sternere discipulis necessum habebat—although he elsewhere understands this of that humilis et supplex oratio which He once for all accomplished in the flesh.

vailed already and brought us in." Those who are now first coming may, with a right feeling of the wrath of the righteous Father, fly first to Christ and cry to Him—Pray Thou for us! But when we have received grace and stand in it, we need do that in the same manner no more. This, then, would distinguish the twofold intercession before and after the πεπιστεύκατε. For of course there is an intercession for believers, such as that which goes on through ch. xvii., and that expressly for the reason that they belong to the Father through faith in Christ, see ch. xvii. 8, 9. And it *goes on* to the end of time; ch. xvii. is only the proleptical commencement of that which, properly speaking, began first in heaven. Braune thinks incorrectly that only *before* the communication of the Spirit the Lord thus prayed for His own—thus making Him the Intercessor *only* for those who are not yet actually partakers of the Holy Ghost. Forgetting altogether 1 Jno. ii. 1! Oh no, rather as Rambach says in his song, "He bears in the sanctuary the precious name of *His people* upon His breast as the true High Priest, His prayer is supported by His almighty power, for His glorified humanity sits in its perfect tabernacle." What is the object of His present prayer for His disciples? We hear it in v. Gerlach: the ever *renewed reinstatement* of the filial relation when it has been interrupted by sin (1 Jno. ii. 1, 2) makes the intercession continually still necessary, since the free love of the Father reigns only *in the filial relation itself.* This is in itself true, but not enough; we find in ch. xvii. the end of His prayer defined to be the disciples' *preservation*, their *growing holiness* and its *consummation.* Thus not simply, with Rambach, "that they may abide united to Thee"—but that they may *become* more fully united.

The Lord is far from denying this continuous, ever necessary intercession; He rather in the οὐ λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι limits the οὐκ ἐρωτήσω to the special meaning which He *now* assigns it. That meaning, however, is no other than this, that He repels every notion of intercession which would represent the Father as not already loving; and further testifies to those whom the Father specially loves as believers, that in *their own prayers* themselves and as such, the first, original intercession would not be needful. Thus there is no correction of ch.

xiv. 16, but it is more definitely explained for our right apprehension of it.[1]

Finally, it is carefully to be noted that while the Saviour Himself seemingly and in a certain sense retires and leaves us to our unhindered fellowship with the Father, He does in reality make Himself most prominent in that He alone is the cause, announcer, and witness that the Father loveth us. Nitzsch: "In order that every one may seek and obtain the Father's love, we all have need of Him who makes that love credible to us, who assures us that He Himself and the Father loveth us. All have need of Him, *whose image must be livingly formed in us by faith*, whom the Father must discern in us, if He Himself is to *love* us" —that is, not only with the love of compassion but of complacency. Does the Lord then mean to say that the Father also so loves the world, as to permit and to hear all its prayer (alas, how often blind and perverted!)? Most assuredly not. Luther: "One thing must be observed here which is to be put by the side of the other, so that the text may not be taken unfairly to pieces. For He also says, The Father Himself loveth you, *because ye have believed in Me.* For He will not do away with His own mediation, as if we might pray *without* and *independently* of Him. But when we have this Mediator *in our hearts*, etc." As in another place he explains, Ye believe in Me, as—"the Father seeth My name upon and in you." Thus far has the free grace which first loved (ch. xv. 16), brought us; hence J. v. Müller in great simplicity cries, "Blessed Father! that which Thou givest Thou reckonest to us as our merit to have received!"

The decisive testimony to their faith which the Lord here gives, despite their weakness, is the same with which He most solemnly presents them to the Father afterwards, in ch. xvii. 7, 8, 25. In the πεφιλήκατε καὶ πεπιστεύκατε we must not seek to find a prospective *future*—Then when ye shall have attained to a full and perfect faith! That the *love* takes precedence of

[1] Münchmeyer thinks this explanation not simple and plain enough. He would amend it thus: "I say not that I will undertake to pray for you *Myself alone*, and that ye will not need to pray to the Father." Let the reader choose! This mere juxtaposition of the prayers (I pray and ye too) we cannot by any means admit.

the faith is to be interpreted according to the relation between believing and loving throughout these final discourses, as we have abundantly illustrated it. The πεφιλήκατε *here* follows primarily upon the φιλεῖ as a significant *anaphora;* for (to speak after the manner of men) one loves me because I love another whom he also loves—thus being one with him in this love. Thus we are raised to the level of the Father, and are one with Him, in loving Christ! "One of the first gifts which is to us the assured foretaste of eternal blessedness, consists in this, that we know ourselves to possess in the love of Christ something which we have in common with God" (Schmieder). And, with equal propriety, glancing forward to vers. 30, 31, we may say with Hiller, "In putting *love* first the Lord designedly reserved *faith* to the last; and thus placed in the lips of the disciples the *We believe!* which they presently uttered." When it is said that, in harmony with the phraseology of Scripture elsewhere, love is here referred to faith as its foundation, this is exegetically as inappropriate as it would be, on the other hand, to regard it as establishing love to be the foundation of faith, because it precedes. Lücke's declaration that "in the exhibition of the relation between the disciples and Christ *personal love* precedes a *full and perfect* faith," is true only when understood according to the fundamental idea of these farewell discourses—in which the personal decision of the heart in the living beginning of faith is called *love.* For how can personal dependence and devotion be possible without confidence in the person of him who claims it? But this trust, in the case of Jesus, has no other foundation than the acceptance of His testimony—a testimony which is asserted throughout all His words —Ἐγὼ παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ (another reading παρὰ θεοῦ or παρὰ τοῦ πατρός) ἐξῆλθον.

Ver. 28. This is once more resumed and sealed anew: Your faith is justified! Verily, I have come forth from the Father, who Himself loveth you and in love hath sent Me into the world! The entire clause, ver. 28, was already anticipated by the Evangelist in ch. xiii. 3 (probably as taken from this passage); but it is here the preparation also for the following prayer—see ch. xvii. 5. It is, once more, a retrospective summary, as of the whole testimony of Jesus concerning Himself

and the counsel of God in Him, so also of His whole history from His birth to His ascension,[1] together with an intimation of the two great supernatural mysteries which are connected with these two limits of His earthly life.[2] *Ἐκ τοῦ πατρός*, adopted by Lachmann instead of *παρά*, is not to be rejected (with Lücke) "because it has a too Trinitarian tone!" For, in truth, these chapters from beginning to end have the Trinitarian tone too evidently to allow us to lose it here at the close. But the reading *παρά* is vindicated by its involving in its meaning the transition to the coming into the world. We cannot deny, on the other hand—weighing well ch. xvii. 5—that this *ἐξῆλθον*, as most of the fathers understood it, expresses the eternal going forth of the Son from the Father (parallel with the *ἐκπορεύεσθαι* of the Spirit, ch. xv. 26); on the other hand, most of the ancient expositors were wrong in not admitting the *transition* to the *ἐλήλυθα* which is already involved in it.[3] In any case, the Lord most clearly testifies that *He* WAS *with the Father*, before He came or was born into the world (still more expressly in ch. xvii.—*before the world was*)—and therefore His *pre-existence*. In our familiar inexact way of speaking we may say of men that they *come* into the world, when they are born and have their beginning in it; but the *ἐλθεῖν* in their case could never be asserted to be an *ἐξ-ελθεῖν* from any *παρά*.[4] Thus His Godhead as well as His humanity is here attested, and with both are bound up His whole work upon earth (ch. xvii. 4) as the reason of His condescending incarnation, and the continuation and perfecting of this work in heaven. For *to what end* did He come into the world, but to become the Saviour

[1] As Fresenius preaches, "a brief epitome of the whole history of Christ." Bengel: Recapitulationem maximam habet hic versus.

[2] Many have even found here the plan of the entire Gospel. First part—I came forth from the Father (the Prologue and Baptist's testimony)—into the world (from ch. i. 35, particularly as *life*, as *light*, down to ch. xii. 46, 50). Part second—Again I leave the world, ch. xiii.-xv., and go to the Father, ch. xvi., xvii. But with all this, compare our remarks at the outset.

[3] See the remarkable *ἐξεληλυθα* already in Mark i. 38 and then Jno. viii. 42.

[4] We need not now refute the notion of a pre-existent humanity which many of our pseudo-theosophists have derived from this saying; its refutation was in the *σὰρξ ἐγένετο* of the Prologue.

of sinners? Again, *to what end* and *in what way* does He return to the Father, but that He may accomplish eternal redemption through death, and diffuse from on high the fruits of His redeeming work? *I leave the world* is in itself a general expression, appropriate to the departure of all men by death; but the πάλιν which belongs especially to the πορεύομαι (*I go back again*, ch. vi. 62), destroys the similarity between His death and the death of all men, just as previously in the case of His birth.[1] He came—He goeth again; and the meaning is, Both through His own power. (Lampe: The spontaneity and Divine operation of the Lord is seen alike in the way of His coming, and in the way of His going again.) Similarly, He goes only in such a manner that He still remains by His Spirit; even as His coming into the world did not exclude His existing in heaven, in God the Father. The doctrine of the bodily presence of Christ in the earth is not (with Beza, Piscator, Ursinus, etc.) to be refuted by this passage, which says nothing at all about it; it does, however, attribute the "*with the Father*" to the humanity also in an exalted sense. There are three births indicated here: the eternal going forth, the birth or being begotten of the Father; the coming into the world or the birth into flesh; and the regeneration or full birth of the Son of God in humanity through the glorification. Between the two mysteries, παρὰ τοῦ πατρός—πρὸς τὸν πατέρα, comes in His life; He asserts the fact, the *how* remains unsolved, for true *faith* is not dependent upon the perfect knowledge of that which indeed transcends all knowledge,

[1] The miraculous conception through the Holy Ghost He passes over in silence, never mentioning it in express word; and this of itself is an argument against the zealots who would insert *this clause* formally in the ordination formulary of the Prussian state-church! It is a truth which faith must find, not as the first thing but as the last deep mystery, the consciousness and confession of which it is well known came late to the Apostles and first Christians.—It is quite true, nevertheless, as Hess remarks that in these farewell discourses the idea of an *earthly father* is utterly and infinitely distant. "The disciples hearing these sayings could never have entertained the thought of—a son of Joseph!" To give prominence to those plain doctrines of salvation which are made prominent in apostolical teaching; and to hold in reserve what it held in reserve, and after the example of Jesus scarcely uttered, because it must be the necessary *consequence* of a living faith, and only *as such* is of eternal importance—cannot be altogether wrong for us *in our time*.

as we shall presently see in the case of the disciples. But if the Socinians (as Bengel says) take this entire testimony, which beamed on the disciples themselves with perfect clearness, as itself no other than a *παροιμία*—*we*, in opposition to the Socinians of all times, understand it better, as *the Spirit* has sealed to us its meaning.

Very touching in its simplicity is the last interruption or rejoinder of *the disciples;* so represented by St John because the speaker, whoever he was, expressed the feeling of all. "They think now, we cannot tell why, that the mystery of His person and His words is fully solved" (Nitzsch). But we do know the reason in part: the so gracious assurance that *the Father Himself loved them* has comforted their hearts, so that they take courage to think that they *understand;* their hearts know with most absolute confidence that *they love Jesus*, and when Jesus now with equal confidence attributes to them faith—how should they not be convinced by His testimony that they *do believe?* Their *πιστεύομεν* is by no means the error or the self-deception in their words; they may very certainly say what they do, for they only echo what He had said in their hearing and attributed to them in ver. 27—*ὅτι ἀπὸ θεοῦ ἐξῆλθες.*[1] But they do not dare to commit themselves to the whole of ver. 28; although they have just declared this saying to be plain they are far from adding the further response—that Thou goest to the Father! In their simple *from God* now as before they seize rightly the fundamental truth—and this the Lord confirms and commends with joy. But as it regards all the rest, the declaration which they see fit to make before the confession of their faith, but which they would have done better to omit, is such evidence of the infirmity of their present understanding as justifies Augustine's remark—usque adeo non intelligunt, ut nec saltem se non intelligere intelligant. They do not speak about these final *παροιμίαις* precisely in the same manner as they spoke about the earlier *παραβολαῖς* in Matt. xiii. 51; for they admit that they do not yet understand the *παροιμίας*, though with the same self-

[1] Hence it is altogether wrong to regard them as understanding it merely in the Jewish sense of chap. iii. 2. Whether (as Luthardt thinks) they lower the meaning by putting *ἀπό* for *ἐξ* depends upon the reading which we have already considered. They certainly repeat *ἐξῆλθες.*

deception as on that occasion they think they understand the last words. The hour, to which the Lord had referred, appears to them already come—notwithstanding that He had expressly said that He still spoke *for the present* in parables. They thus seem to correct in their innocence their Master's word—O no, Thou hast thought too slightly of us; see, we understand Thee already! Lampe: "They are sorry because they are deemed so unapt by their Master, who thinks that they understand not His discourses but need another teacher. Hence they go so far as to contradict Christ, and invert His plainest words, denying that He had spoken in a mysterious manner." This last is far too much, since the disciples refer in their *now* expressly to the last word, vers. 26–28, as spoken παῤῥησία, *plainly;* but the *contradiction* must remain. Finally, and this is the strangest thing in their words, they assign as the *reason* of their *believing* (which unconsciously to themselves has a better reason!) by ἐν τουτῷ something entirely beside the purpose, something suggested by their reflection at the moment, and which moreover itself rests upon a misunderstanding. "That Jesus in an unexpected manner Himself expresses what they have long felt, that His words were deeply mysterious for their understanding—*this circumstance* they adduce as the confirmation (rather the new and decisive reason) of their believing." (Tholuck.) Just as if one should joyfully say, I now understand thee, for thou hast told me that I understand thee not! Is then their ignorance itself the foundation of their faith? The confusion in which they speak is so great that we cannot educe any clear idea from their words; but the sincere goodness of heart which holds fast to something supposed to be understood, redeems them from their folly. The Lord had spoken of a day in which they should *ask nothing:* they think this day already come, and interpret the not asking in a quite different way. We cannot see (with Lücke) how this was "no misunderstanding of His word, but a subtle application given to them;" especially when he admits that the "over-estimation of their great present privileges was their only error"—an error, indeed, this which was very great, and lying at the foundation of all! Now know we, that is, now we understand Thee, and the meaning of Thy words: that Thou knowest all things and needest not that any man should ask

Thee![1] This is no more an express attribution of Divine omniscience (as the systematic divines have derived from it), than was Peter's word afterwards, chap. xxi. 17. It is a deep presentiment, which became more and more clear during the forty days, and finally found its full expression in Acts i. 24. They mean, however, as much as this (Meyer), "that Thou discernest thoughts and anticipatest questions"—thinking, doubtless, of ver. 19. *All* other teachers must be diligently *questioned* by their disciples, if they would enter into their condition of mind and effectually *teach* them[2]—but He who came out from God *needed* this not. As they thus *invert* the Lord's word in ver. 23—For He had spoken of *their* not needing any longer to ask—they would in fact assert (by a very unwarranted anticipation)—Thou speakest now so plainly, tellest us so clearly unasked what is in our hearts, that *we also* have no need to ask Thee anything.

Ver. 31. The disentangling of all these mistakes and this confusion would have then been a profitless task:—and the day of the Spirit was coming, the revelation of which alone enabled even St John so aptly to describe that former obscurity of their understanding. The Lord passes it all by, and confines Himself to their πιστεύομεν, regarding that with the utmost graciousness and even with joy as a genuine germ, and *confirming* it as the result of His life and teaching. Or does He deny even that? The damping tone of the following verse has misled many into making this ἄρτι πιστεύετε a *question*. So many MSS., and Euthymius, and among the moderns Olshausen, who concisely decides, "Certainly it is more correct," and B.-Crusius, with equal confidence, "A question, as in ch. i. 51"—which passage, however, as our exposition shows, is no question at all. Pfenninger was similarly misled, and myself in earlier life.[3] De Wette's and Allioli's translations make it a question, and the Heb. New Testament unhappily has the ה interrogative. Lücke was first inclined to this—adducing besides ch. i. 51 the more

[1] The construction of the ἵνα with the Indic. is not unfrequent, as we know, in the New Testament.

[2] Hence the proposition which Eichhorn suggested in vain, as to the conduct of academical examinations, might be very useful if not absolutely necessary!

[3] Der Brief Jacobi, S. 9.

appropriate ch. xiii. 38—but he afterward corrected himself, doubting whether "Jesus would so lightly quench the smoking flax." This reason against the question is a good one, but far from being sufficiently strong or profound; Lampe's assertion that it comes to the same thing in the end is rash, for a deep insight into the whole train of the connection must show the interrogation to be altogether inadmissible. Tholuck lays much stress upon the *now*, as proving the words to be affirmative; he is much more justified in saying that "the disciples' really having faith cannot be doubted." Does not the whole of ch. xvii. most solemnly attribute this to them, and give *testimony* to their believing? And could the same John who wrote ch. ii. 11, and recorded ch. vi. 69, now be supposed to declare that the Lord at the close of all still doubted the faith of His eleven? Can *that* be thought possible as the result of all His labour upon them? Compare, moreover, Matt. xvi. 17, 18. It had been the aim and object of the whole prophetic ministry of Jesus to make some disciples (not the Apostles alone) susceptible for the coming of the Spirit of truth and the benefits of His passion, laying in them the foundation of faith in His own person;—and was this not attained at the end of all, was it even still a questionable thing? After such an expression of doubt could He have gone on to pray for them as in ch. xvii.?—Let all this be well pondered, and the note of interrogation will certainly be renounced as *impossible!* Nor is the most distant irony[1] to be assumed in this earnest and frank Indicative; the ἀληθῶς of ch. xvii. 18 decides against this. The Lord must be regarded as uttering this πιστεύετε with *gladness;* His joy beholding prospectively the ultimate breaking forth of the surviving germ of their faith, and therefore not disturbed by its present weakness. It is only *for the disciples' sake* that He adds ver. 32, in order that His prediction of the heavy hour of pressure might prepare them for it and help them through, humbling them now that their faith might be purified and strengthened.[2] The *now*,[3]

[1] As many suppose, admitting the Indicative. There was one arrogant prater who even represented the Lord as saying this "*with a smile of pity!*"

[2] Rieger: To keep the smoking flax from being quenched in the darkness: they would be able to say—He foretold us all this.

[3] Bengel is far-fetched here—Your faith is ἄρτιος, perfect, apt.

consequently, when we think here at the close of the beginning of the discourse, appears in its retrospective reference to indicate an *end attained*, expressed with strong emphasis at this solemn crisis; it is "the great issue of His labours upon them, expressed in one definite word" (Lange). And *not till then* does it assume a prospective reference, the end attained being regarded now as no other than a weak beginning. To regard, with Luthardt, this latter as the only sense ("for the present—but soon!"), is to us absolutely wrong, and altogether out of keeping with the solemnity of this great crisis. The emphasis of ἄρτι, standing at the beginning of the sense, points rather backward than forward, though the latter must be regarded as necessarily involved. *So far* we cannot exclude from the ἄρτι the *gentle blame* that the disciples in their confident πιστεύομεν thought too little of the testing future and the often predicted *hour of trial*. But, for the rest, the πιστεύετε which the Lord simply repeats, without any addition, would say—Yea, ye do now believe *in God and in Me;* for this was essentially contained, though undeveloped, in their ἀπὸ θεοῦ ἐξῆλθες.

Ver. 32. *Behold*—the Lord has already before His eyes the sight of His little circle of disciples severed as branches, *scattered* as driven sheep! The Lord refers to the same prophecy of Zechariah which He expressly cites in Matt. xxvi. 31; we shall give the exposition of it in the next volume. Similarly in John x. 13, it was said of the coming wolf, σκορπίζει τὰ πρόβατα. This fleeing of the disciples when Jesus was taken was assuredly, as the Lord in Matt. xxvi. 31 and here also regards it, an expression of their faith's weakness, a σκανδαλίζεσθαι, *a leaving Him*, Matt. xxvi. 56 (as here ἀφῆτε). One betrays, one denies, *all* the others (ἕκαστος) leave Him too by a kind of denial. Hence εἰς τὰ ἴδια as corresponding with this must have an intensive meaning; not merely being the obvious qualification of *scattered*,[1] but as it were the abandonment of their following and the retracing of their steps. Bengel says well: εἰς τὰ ἴδια, to the things which ye before left for My sake. We have not

[1] Vatablus: to the place where each might regard himself safe. Grotius: each in his *hiding-place*, for ἴδιον is said also of the place where any one retires for a time. Lampe follows these, and compares 1 Macc. vi. 54, ἕκαστος εἰς τὸν τόπον αὐτοῦ, so that the ἴδια here are consueta discipulorum, quæ

to ask, what and where these ἴδια externally were, whether in Jerusalem or Galilee (comp. ch. xix. 27, or πρὸς ἑαυτούς, ch. xx. 10)—but the external gives here its signification to the internal; whosoever leaves the Lord, returns back into himself and to his own things. This, however, is but one side; for on the other hand this fleeing of the disciples was permitted to them, since they availed not to succour Him who trode the wine-press *alone* (Isa. lxiii. 3); indeed it was, when the hour came, indirectly commanded to them, Jno. xviii. 8. Their *faith* by no means utterly ceased in this time of scattering; it approved itself as opposed to the world sufficiently strong to carry them through their distress as sheep without a shepherd.

The Lord immediately passes from the terrifying μόνον ἀφῆτε into a tone of *consolation.* That which He had intimated to the Jews, ch. viii. 29, He now openly declares to the disciples, with reference especially to that heavy hour. Then was the Lord *alone*, abandoned of all human consolation and help in the midst of the bands of the wicked; and this abandonment was to Him a grief, the scattering of His disciples was a deeply penetrating pang, one co-operating element in His lot to bear all our sin and carry all our infirmity. But *the Father*, without whom and independent of whom the Son cannot be without losing Himself (ch. viii. 16)—left Him not alone, was and did abide *with Him.* How this is to be reconciled with and modifies the abandonment by God upon the cross, we shall see when our exposition reaches that place. Let us here, in transition to the following verse, mark how all this is a type for the entire future of the church. Often is this scattering of the disciples from His presence repeated, in various degrees and with various manifestations, but He is not alone. And even if in this day all men were to leave Him—which is of course only supposition—He abides what He is, and the Father is with Him! *His holy cause can never be forsaken or lost*—as Nitzsch preaches. Calvin thus remarks: Whosoever well ponders this will hold firm his faith though the world shake, nor will the defection of

Hierosolymis habebant, hospitia. Hirsch. Bib.: "to the place which each could first find in his perplexity." The Heb. N. T. has לְבֵיתוֹ—which does not by any means exhaust the expression.

all others overturn his confidence; we do not render God His full honour, unless He alone is felt to be sufficient to us.

Ver. 33. The Lord here finally, contemplating still the end of all in His typical-perspective glance, comprehends in one the immediate sequel (ver. 32, *καὶ νῦν ἐλήλυθεν* is doubtless genuine) and the entire future of His disciples while they are found *in the world.* In these last words He "condenses the sum of the instruction which He had ministered to the disciples at the last supper."[1] In *εἰρήνην ἔχειν* He embraces the aim and the fruit of His discourses in one,[2] and we may refer to what was said upon this deep word at ch. xiv. 27; the antithesis with *θλίψις* here, however, makes prominent the idea of confidence, assurance, and joyfulness in a *salvation* which was already sure, and which would afterward be complete. There is for His own, as for all the world, no other peace than that which is *in Him.* This is to be understood in the full depth of meaning of the vine-similitude, which has another echo here; not, however, in the sense of a rigorous demand of perfect faith in Him and union with Him. The weak and dispersed disciples who forsake Him retain so far their peace as they are not therefore forsaken of Him, and they should find their peace again as soon as they find Him again; rather, when He who does not leave them comes to them again. If *His words* (*ταῦτα λελάληκα ὑμῖν*) abide in us, that of itself assures our abiding upon and in Him (ch. xv. 7); we may say, generally, with Luther, that the peace of faith springs from the *word* embraced and held fast, depends upon it alone. "My repose and peace stand in nothing but what my Lord Christ *speaks,* as in Ps. cxix. 165, Great peace have they who love Thy word!" That is, with Luther's qualification, "provided that the word has its firm place *in the heart.*" As long as we are *in the world* trials and temptations not yet overcome are perfectly consistent with this —and this, indeed, is the highest consolation, as seen in the *ἀλλὰ θαρσεῖτε,* without which the concluding with *ἐν ἐμοὶ εἰρήνην* would have left us in only greater dismay. "He acknowledges that we in the world must have tribulation, but

[1] Nitzsch, zweite Auswahl, S. 113.

[2] Pfenninger, generally so useful to the expositor, here strangely interprets, "that ye may be without anxiety concerning Me!"

He encourages us at the same time by the assurance of peace in Him. *He is not alone, and leaveth not alone.*" (Nitzsch.) Not even then when we have to cry after Him, "Why hast Thou forsaken me!"

Θλίψιν ἔχετε we prefer with Griesbach, Scholz, Knapp, Schott, Matthäi, though Lachmann holds to the ἕξετε of the Text. Rec.; Erasmus corrected the Vulg. *habebitis* into *habetis*. The present indicates the continuous and abiding condition of His disciples—Ye *are* in the world, therefore ye *have* tribulation. But let it be carefully noted to what extent the *in the world* is opposed to the *in Me*, in order that we may see clearly that the words do not refer *merely* to *external* trial. (Neander: of their living in *external* contact with the world, which imposes manifold affliction upon the *external* man.) *Tribulation* is certainly not alone "the violence and enmity of the world, which causes grief and anxiety to the disciples"—their διώκειν and πειράζειν. For all this would not interrupt our peace, if the persecution did not meet with and excite weakness of faith, and the temptation sinful desire, *in us*. So much as the world has still in us, and the ἐν ἐμοί is consequently not yet perfect, so much is there lacking or inimical to our peace. We must call to mind the θλίψις of the woman in childbirth, a tribulation from within and of herself; and mark the opposites, εἰρήνη, θαρσεῖν,—in order to perceive the inappropriateness of a merely external interpretation of the word. The world not only *persecutes*, it *tempts* also, yea it leads us still to the σκορπίζεσθαι and σκανδαλίζεσθαι, to the partial and temporary abandonment of our Lord; and thus it confounds us and thereby *takes away our courage*. Again, the *tribulation* itself which the world and sin cause to those who cannot any longer joy or even be contented in the world and sin, is an encouraging effect of faith; the Lord could never say to *His disciples*—In the world ye have peace! When that is the case, His word and consolation have no more place in us. "This tribulation in the world is the sole evidence of our *heterogeneity*"—writes Hamann, comforting himself, to Herder: instead of the exaggerated and doubtful "*sole* evidence," we would rather say, the *first* and the *abiding* evidence. And here holds good the θαρσεῖτε, the final and highest expression of which, concentrating in itself all

the previous and subsequent consolations of Scripture, is *here* uttered by the lips of the Redeemer Himself, who *for us* surrendered Himself to tribulation:—He who can lay hold of *that* word, and make it a reality, has the second and complementary evidence for his full assurance that he is in Christ and no longer of the world. *The two are united*, the tribulation and the peace; yet so that the peace continually has the better, realising the θαρσεῖν, and the εἰρήνην ἔχειν holds its full force:—this is the signature of the disciples in their present state. For—"the Lord speaks of that which lies *in the interim*," that is, between the beginning and the consummation of their discipleship.

But He Himself, the author and finisher of faith, to whom we look in order to run with patience the race of conflict which still lies before us—has overcome! As the *prince* of this world (according to ch. xiv. 30) has been baffled in Him, so consequently and most assuredly is *the world* also with all its still blustering adherence to the discomfited enemy, the judged usurper.[1] Christ has overcome *in the same way* of suffering, and obedience, and even temptation; He indeed *without sin*, but even that is imputed to us and appropriated by us in faith. He anticipates here the νενίκηκα before He has reached Gethsemane and Golgotha—and how should this word stimulate us, uttered now from above! So our faith in Him is the victory which has already overcome the world. (1 Jno. v. 4.) "The conflict and suffering which *we* now have, is not the real war, but only the celebration, a part of the glory, of this *victory*." (Luther.) Is the world still essentially the same—Christ also is the same! That is, as the Eternal One who contended and won for us in our flesh—not as our modern folly perverts His word, See how gloriously I, a firm child of humanity, overcome, be bold also yourselves and do the like! But our θαρσεῖν comes only from the ἐν ἐμοί, from the ἐγὼ νενίκηκα; and we utter boldly St John's question still in the hearing of all

[1] Bengel remarks on ch. xiv. 30: Hic principem mundi amolitur Jesus; alterâ colloquii hujus parte finiente, mundum, c. xvi. 33. Zinzendorf, too much in the manner of those who attach edifying thoughts to the word without true exposition, shows on "the overcoming the world" how the Saviour won the human race with love and good deeds, making the wicked His friends!

—*Who is he*, where is there one, that overcometh the world, *except he that believeth* that Jesus is the Son of God?—Let us close with the beautiful and profound word of Nitzsch, "in Him all overcome who rejoice to be the world overcome by Him." For assuredly, even in *this* sense, as we otherwise know, He alone is the Overcomer.

THE HIGH-PRIESTLY PRAYER.

(Ch. xvii.)

Ταῦτα ἐλάλησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς—the Evangelist plainly combines in one historical whole all previous "*ταῦτα λελάληκα*" which he has recorded; and now begins with a new *καὶ εἶπε*, adding another simple and sublime historical note—that Jesus then, thus speaking, before his, the Evangelist's eyes, lifted up His own eyes to heaven. All that can be said for the historically certain truth of the entire Gospel, and that applies to its actual reproduction of our Lord's sayings, so wonderfully yet so naturally effected by the Holy Ghost;—all that has been said in defence of this a thousand times by orthodox expositors with more or less confidence and wisdom, may be applied with all the greater force to this *Prayer*, inasmuch as it is the climax and consummation of all His discourses, pressing nearest to heaven and most immediately breathing of its mysteries,—a triumphantly and serenely bright *It is finished* before the darkness surrounded Him upon the cross, so that that must be first rightly interpreted by this! Words which none but the only begotten of the Father could ever utter; and which could never have entered the heart of man if they had not been actually spoken by Him! A final testimony to Himself on the part of the Son, uttered before the Father and to the Father Himself alone; a most sacred and *pleading* expression of the inmost reality of that self-consciousness in which He alone knew who Himself was, One with the One above in heaven! A more awful and convincing attestation to the listening disciples, and to all Christian men who hear while they read, and read while they hear, than any *Ἀμὴν Ἀμήν* which could fall from His lips, than any oath which might

attest His—I Jesus am He, the *Christ*, the *Son* of the Blessed! —"*Father!*" This is the testimony of the Son, who in a transcendent sense makes His own that distantly typical word of a traduced sufferer (Job xvi. 17–19)—No injustice is in Mine hands, My prayer also is pure—O earth, cover not thou My blood!—behold, My witness is in heaven, and He who knoweth Me is on high!—"Father! Thou knowest Me! Thou understandest Me! Righteous Father! the world knoweth Thee not, *but I know Thee*"—thus testifies *the Son*. We who by His grace believe on Him may leave to fools the folly of discussing in their hearts or in their books whether Jesus actually and literally did thus pray! That which to their folly is "conceivable," that some other might have afterwards invented, arranged, or worked up—not merely with incredible audacity, but with still more incredible correctness and insight—such a prayer as this out of some pre-existent materials, is to us, in proportion to the measure of our faith, more and more evidently the most inconceivable of all impossibilities. "Every one of these words could have been spoken by Him alone, and by Him only at such a conjuncture." (Theremin.) Therefore "we cannot thankfully enough wonder at and magnify the goodness of God, which hath taken care that one of the prayers in which the Son of God poured out His heart to the Father should be so carefully communicated to us." All sophistical questioning as to the process of St John's remembrance and the relation of his own spirit in the matter, may be rebutted by the counter-question—How could this disciple, paying his own homage to the Lord, have presumed to place in His lips by an εἶπεν the words of his own spirit? We make bold to obviate one offence of foolishness by another, and say, If Jeremiah formerly could dictate over again to Baruch his scribe the words of the roll which Jehoiakim burned—might not the Lord of glory have given to His beloved disciple the pen of the Spirit, that he should faithfully reproduce and record the prayers which He had offered up for His church to the end of time? Alas, alas, we detect in most even of our orthodox expositors, the simplicity of whose faith is confused by the unbelief of the falsely learned, a tendency scarcely concealed to assume even in this chapter the composition and arrangement of St John's own mind. To Lücke "the

τῇ δόξῃ ᾗ εἶχον (ver. 5), flows from the gnosis of the *Evangelist*" — and attempting to solve a supposed contradiction here, he says, "*John* distinguishes between the eternal and the temporal δόξα!" Treating of the order of thought, vers. 25, 26, he proceeds, "Who can imagine that *John* merely, etc.?"[1] Olshausen thinks it enough to indicate "*that the author of the Gospel*, as everywhere so here, does not conceal *his idea* of the Divine nature of Christ." And much else like this might be quoted to be condemned. We, for our own part—and this is our testimony and avowal in common with the Church, which sets its seal to this Gospel in ch. xxi. 24, and seals it still—should feel ourselves reproved in the utterance of such expressions by the Spirit of truth, as guilty of the ἁμαρτία of οὐ πιστεύειν in the sense of ch. xvi. 9. We say with Braune, and more decidedly than he, "Does not Jesus pray at the end in the language of John? I would almost add—so Christly has become the language of this disciple of His heart, so thoroughly has he imbibed his Lord's spirit and style of thought." Yes, verily, that which is now called Johannæan was first Christly—whence else could it have come? The glorification-prayer did not spring from the gnosis of the prologue; but this prologue, which gives us not the gnosis of man but the witness of God, sprang from this prayer, from the self-testimony of the Only-begotten reaching its culmination in the petitions which, *in these words*, He offered up in the flesh.

On the καὶ εἶπε Augustin writes: Poterat Dominus noster unigenitus et coæternus Patri in forma servi et ex forma servi, si hoc opus esset, orare silentio: sed ita se Patri exhibere voluit precatorem, *ut meminisset, nostrum se esse doctorem.* Proinde eam, quam fecit, orationem pro nobis, *notam fecit et nobis:* quoniam tanti magistri non solum apud ipsos sermocinatio, sed etiam ipsius pro ipsis ad Patrem oratio *discipulorum est ædificatio.* Et si illorum, qui hæc dicta aderant audituri, profecto et nostra qui fueramus *conscripta lecturi.*[2] And Bengel's briefer and more

[1] "This is eternal life, *says John*, that they might know Thee and Him whom Thou hast sent—!" Thus Schenkel. With all brotherly respect for a man who has so much advanced in soundness and true zeal since 1839, I cannot but refer to this striking example.

[2] This last means, *When* He thus prayed He did not speak to the wind, but provided for the permanence of His words for posterity.

pointed expression of the same thing, is most obviously correct —orat Patrem simulque discipulos *docet*. Which design of this praying and speaking aloud is literally expressed in ver. 13. This *docet* was not merely "the natural result," as Lücke maintains, though in opposition to this verse, but *at the same time* the actual *design* of our Lord; *simul*, as Bengel says, more discreetly than Lampe, who goes too far when he interprets, *Not so much* for His own sake as for theirs; and applies this still more incorrectly when he regards vers. 1–5 as spoken *only* for the disciples' instruction. Most assuredly this was not the case, but He teaches and edifies the disciples by admitting them to look into His praying heart; consequently it is actually *His heart* which prays also on His own account *in the presence of the Father*. Concerning this blending of prayer for self with a regard to men who hear —in its perfection possible only to the Son—we have already spoken, when at the grave of Lazarus.[1]

Luther bids us, in order to a right understanding of these simple yet inexhaustible words, to consider, "Who the Man is that thus prays, and Who is prayed unto, and how great a thing is prayed for." Melancthon declares, nec digniorem, nec sanctiorem, nec fructuosiorem nec magis patheticam vocem in cœlo ac terra unquam auditam fuisse, quam hanc ipsius Filii Dei precationem. Bengel testifies, hoc caput in tota scriptura est verbis facillimum, sensibus profundissimum. Spener avows, "that the true understanding of this prayer goes beyond the measure of faith which the Lord is wont to impart to His disciples during their pilgrimage." Therefore when he drew near the end of his own pilgrimage, he caused it to be read three times aloud to him, but never ventured to preach upon it. We have, however, expository preachers upon it in abundance; and many called and uncalled have made their essays upon its interpretation. May we not, nay, ought we not to add our attempt? Although it goes beyond our understanding—like much else, indeed everything, in Scripture—yet it is enshrined there that we may ponder it, with the help of the same Spirit who gave to St John that

[1] It is sufficiently plain from the tenor of both fact and narrative, that the Lord did not go apart to pray, as His wont was, *John alone* being near enough to hear His words.

deep insight with which he wrote it down, and Who is promised also to us.

The incomparable and crystalline simplicity of the words of this prayer is a very great assistance to our understanding of its meaning, alluring us to penetrate the deep things which they so plainly utter. The Lord manifestly would be understood, and therefore speaks of the highest wonders and mysteries with such marvellous plainness of speech as is never found in the gnostic or speculatist, and can never be attained even by His servants praying through His Spirit in His name. So high is its strain that none has ever approached it since; and yet the words are so childlike that children find their instruction, and edification, and comfort in them. To Strauss this wonderful chapter presents itself, not as a prayer, but as a product of reflection, as a discourse concerning Jesus: but he knows not what praying is, at least what the prayer of the Son of God is in that glory and illumination, which He already anticipates while He asks for it. "Should it be wondered at that perfected *feeling* is throughout most intense *thought?*" says Lange beautifully. Less striking, but with equally sound meaning, is Braune's remark, "Here is the inwardness of the East, the home of religion, seized and expressed with the precision of the West, the home of science." We would make this more emphatic, and say, The most glowing mystic and the most careful thinker finds each his own language in these words, embracing both opposites in one! We can form some slight conception of the intensity of emotion with which the human heart of our Lord would at this crisis vibrate to the truth, the essential reality of the things of which He spoke—and hence the discourse which utters them bubbles forth as a gushing stream. And again, what majestic repose, what luminous transparency of the thoughts, one flowing from the other in adjusted order, all forming one connected development, and for the most part each one either the explanation of what precedes it, or a further deduction of its consequences.

And may we presume to analyse such a prayer as this? Yes, for being *such* it must have the most perfect and exact arrangement and system, adjusted down to the minutest point—could we but seize it aright! The more of spirit and life there is in prayer, the more will there be of the living system of the Spirit

in its organic development; but it is better to arrive at this by an inward sympathy with the process of the prayer, praying it after Him, than to impose upon it a system from without, in derogation of its sanctity. We shall therefore content ourselves with a very general preparatory analysis of the whole; and when after that we enter upon detailed exposition, every single word will itself guide us to the next. Thus much is at once clear: The Lord, approaching the Father as His Son, proceeds from *Himself* and His glorification now come, laying claim on that account to eternal life for all given to Him;—He then as Intercessor embraces all His disciples present and future—beginning with the commencement of His work within them, and continually enlarging the circle of His intercession until it reaches eternity and the full consummation of all;—and, finally, He carries back their glorification with becoming dignity to the first words concerning His own—*I in them!* This prayer has been termed with perfect propriety the *High-priestly* prayer: not merely vers. 9 and 19, but the entire strain approves this. He prayed thus *in testimony how He would henceforth intercede for and represent them in heaven.* The beginning of the High Priest's office is, in the living transition of the unity of all the offices, the end also of the prophetic.

There is, indeed, as Schmieder[1] observes, a distinction, but it is not, we think, an essential one, between this present *intercession* and His future *mediation.* It is not by an "inexact" use of the term that the church calls the Lord's mediation now in heaven an intercession; this language is justified as exhibiting and bringing home to us heavenly things by earthly types. That we do not now ask, Lord Jesus, pray for us! is partly untrue, since many of our hymns and prayers do use such language; but partly the result of an internal restraint of propriety.

The three main divisions are so simple and so plain, that this trichotomy has been generally acknowledged from the earliest times; their more detailed organisation will appear as we proceed. *First* is the supplication to the Father for the glorification of the Son, as the ground and summary of the whole,—*Δόξασόν με, σὺ πάτερ!* But with this is connected the instructive expla-

[1] In his profound, but rather theosophically contemplative than expository, treatise on the High-priestly prayer (Hamburg 1848) S. 123.

nation, preparing for what follows, that from the *knowledge* of God the Father in the Son glorifying and glorified by Him, the *eternal life* of believers should proceed. This is embraced and concluded in vers. 1–5. *Secondly* follows the specific *intercession* for His own whom He *leaves behind* in the world, commencing with the revelation of the name and communication of the word which had already been vouchsafed, and proceeding through preservation unto holiness in the truth—embracing indeed with these first disciples all future disciples too. (Vers. 6–19.) Here we have, further, in vers. 6–13, a more general foundation with its own definite conclusion; ver. 14 beginning anew with a more deeply penetrating development of the expression.[1] *In the third place* follows, from ver. 20 ("*not for these alone*" looks backward also in its application) to the close, *the widest comprehension* of His whole church—all *one* in Him, as He in the Father, partakers finally of His *glory*, as they were previously, and as the foundation for that, of His *love*.

The arrangement of Olshausen and Lücke makes vers. 1–8 the first part, and certainly vers. 6–8 contain a general fundamental statement which flows immediately from the preceding; but as certainly the intercession for His own who have received and held fast His word, is already begun in them. Lampe would resolve it into an oratio *bipartita*, the division being between vers. 10 and 11—the former part laying the foundation, and the latter being the detailed development. We are far from contending about it, and leave to every one his own view; it is manifest that in the fulness of this prayer many various organic arrangements may be found interpenetrating each other.[2] Very

[1] Melancthon finds *four* essential things prayed for on behalf of His church: the first and most prominent being the conservation of true doctrine, concord the second, then the full application of His sacrificial merit, and lastly joy and eternal glory. We regard, however, the first as the foundation presupposed in vers. 6–11. The τηρεῖν ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι has obviously a wider meaning; their *preservation*, as in ver. 15, is the proper *centre* of the intercession (as Lampe rightly regards it), but this is effected only in their *sanctification*.

[2] Schmieder speaks at first of *six* petitions, vers. 5, 11, 15, 17, 20, 24. But he afterwards in his exposition adds to the one great supplication for Himself which embraces all, three others for His disciples; more correctly taking vers. 20–23 as one additional.

much more important than any arbitrary arrangement is it that we should contemplate, feel, wonder at, adore, and in adoring at the same time understand, the most sacred, sinless, and spotless *illumination* and *repose* with which the unspotted High Priest, now near the anguish of Gethsemane, presents Himself here before the Father. What a contrast is this, and what a revelation does this light and glory shed upon that subsequent obscuration![1] No word of *sin* and guilt, with which, however, every other son of man must appear before God in death. Not even a word of infirmity, no *Help Me!* all is merged into the one *Glorify Thou Me!* Nor is there even a *thanksgiving* at the end of the accomplished work, only the testimony—I have finished the work, Thou gavest it to Me! One great *petition*—and that for things which, according to human thought and worldly estimate, would be the most improbable of all on such an occasion—and even this is scarcely a *petition*, for He who humbles Himself to ask it places Himself, unlike every other petitioner, by the side of the Father—*We!* (vers. 11, 22), and speaks thus of the giving of eternal glory, Father, *I will!* ver. 24. Again, for that which is from eternity His own He nevertheless *prays!* Where else are such marvels found? Who can sound the depths of all this?

Ver. 1. We cannot admit the reading *καὶ ἐπάρας,—εἶπε*, which Griesb., Lachmann, and Tisch. have accepted; Lücke regards it as a mere correction of the style, but we set it down as a correction which would exchange the emphatic simplicity of the rigorously historical opening for a descriptive effect which is quite inappropriate to St John. He does not even lift up His *hands* toward heaven, like other earnest petitioners who urge their suit: that would have been unsuitable to the repose and majesty of this prayer, in which He exhibits Himself as One with the Father, and as having at once that which He asks. But He lifts up His *eyes*, in testimony where His heart is, and whither He is going. Toward *heaven*, for although the Father and heaven itself are at the same time within Him, yet on the other hand the throne of glory is not the less there on high. Many make this a reason for thinking that the prayer

[1] Rupert's notion is inconceivable, that *this* prayer was that offered in Gethsemane!

was offered up on the way, in the open road, but we have already refuted this.[1] The heaven toward which Jesus looked is not so much the visible heaven (in which "the bright full moon was shining") as the invisible (Col. i. 16).[2] Nor did the Lord praying within the chamber need any "open window" in order to look towards heaven—as some have tamely imagined. Lücke well exposes this, "To the praying eye heaven, the throne of God, is everywhere visible, comp. Ps. cxxiii. 1." But what Schmieder says here of the heaven within the praying soul is only a meditation upon the words, and not an exposition of them. The *first* word of the praying Lord is, *Father*—and nothing more. Not *our* Father, which He could never say; not even *My* Father, for that would be here too much. In the entire prayer there are six invocations; twice with this word in its bare simplicity, twice with *σὺ πάτερ* corresponding to the adjoined *I;* once *πάτερ ἅγιε*, and once finally *πάτερ δίκαιε*. The hour is come—so speaks the Son to the all-knowing Father in the real address of person to person, presenting Himself in this first word as ready in His voluntary will for this glorification. Come is *the hour*—this connects itself closely with ch. xii. 23, 28; as the *glorifying* which follows connects itself with ch. xiii. 31, 32. Yet the thought of the glorification hastens most distinctly over the hour of suffering, and forward to the state of glory in heaven, ver. 5: it is throughout one and the same glorification of which He speaks. The *first petition* is the preliminary expression of the substance of the whole, out of which all is unfolded, into which all returns back. *Glorify—Me!* As the *hour* is specifically mentioned, Luther is right in saying, "He prays with such feeling and solemnity as if He *already hung upon the cross*, as if He should cry,—I am now in the very midst of shame and death, lying in deepest darkness, *the time is come* that I should be lifted up, and set in honour." But it is just as true, and of as deep significance, that He thus prays in the clear consciousness of the anticipated *νενίκηκα*, and

[1] I can only marvel to find Schmieder saying, "Thus went Jesus, in colloquy with the Father, through the silent streets of Jerusalem, etc." My thought can represent the High Priest "standing before God," neither as *going* nor as *sitting*.

[2] Alford's English excellently expresses it—*Heaven* is not the *sky*.

that He cannot therefore cry first σῶσόν με. Here in the Father's presence He terms Himself not the Son of man, although the glorification of the human nature is here concerned, the Divine needing no glorification; for it is *upon the ground and prerogative of the equal Godhead united to His humanity, that He prays in this humanity.* Throughout the prayer we find the most complete *communicatio idiomatum.* There has been already in the past an ἐδόξασα of the Father (ch. xii. 28); but the full and perfect glorification is now first to come. He begins by referring to Himself as *objectively presented* to His own faith and contemplation—*Thy Son;* but this is in vers. 4, 5, retracted into the subjective I and Me, while the I and Thou then pave the way for the still more exalted *We,* of ver. 11. That Thy Son also may glorify Thee: —even in this juxtaposition and reciprocation there is decisive testimony to the *equal Divinity* of the Son; for what creature could presume to say before the throne and face of the Creator, that it would glorify Him *as* He it. The καί, wanting in the Vulg., and rejected by Lachm., is capable of vindication, and of great significance as giving prominence to this meaning—which, however, without it would be essentially the same.

The Son, further, desires His own glorification not *egoistically,* in any imaginable sense of this word as appertaining to sin and separation from God; but solely to *the end that* He again may glorify the Father, and give back to Him the might, honour, and glory which Himself should receive, and here once more we find that first petition after the invocation of the Father in heaven, a petition which includes all others,—Hallowed by *Thy name!*[1] How and to what end, then, may and must *the Father Himself* (this absolute expression is here alone

[1] The parallel drawn in Richter's Hausbibel (on Lu. xi.), between the *entire* Lord's prayer and *this* prayer, will not hold good; for all the succeeding petitions are here merged in the first, and that only as far as the *sinless* High Priest could make them His own. Nor can it be said, strictly speaking, that the order is here reversed, this prayer beginning with glorification and *redemption,* and ending with the manifestation of the Father's *name.* For, to the Redeemer regarded as now victorious and out of the reach of all evil, the δόξασον does not include a σῶσον, and the γνωρίζειν τὸ ὄνομα at the end is something different from the *hallowing* of *our* prayer. What in that prayer, however, the Lord does use, has here its beginning.

found) first *be glorified?* It is obvious, not to and in Himself; but as the holy and righteous Father *in men*, who through *sin* have come short of His δόξα. Thus He is first of all to be glorified in the humanity of this God-man, who prepares and presents Himself to that end; then, through Him in His disciples, so that in this first word concerning the mutual glorification, that is already involved and included which follows in vers. 10, 23, 26—ἐγὼ ἐν αὐτοῖς. The glorification of the Father through the Son glorified by the Father is—"the restoration of the Divine image in humanity," the issue of which is expressed in 2 Thess. i. 10.

Ver. 2. There now follows a more specific development and explanation of the sense in which this glorification of the Father to and in fallen humanity is intended. Καθώς, as a connecting particle, has been variously regarded, the greater part of expositors perceiving the specific force of the word, but giving it a restricted instead of a general meaning. Euthymius makes it summarily a ὅτι or διό, and Grotius, somewhat nearer the point, rationem reddit præcedentium, et valet *siquidem;* for which Olshausen, too, adduces Rom. i. 28; 1 Cor. i. 6. In this sense it has been expressed thus, That Thy Son may glorify Thee *according to His destiny:* nor can it be doubted that such a meaning is primarily included—Thou hast decreed and ordered it that I should be the Saviour of all men. Rieger: "This His first petition He *supports* by the consideration that the mediatorial office which He had received required such a glorification; and that without it the good pleasure of the Lord could not prosper in His hands." Lücke, again, somewhat varies this: "The reciprocal glorification *corresponds with* the authority which the Father had given Him, etc. The *causal relation* which καθώς expresses is this, that the reciprocal glorification, the *end*, must answer to the *beginning*, the sending, the preparation, and the vocation of the Son." All this is true, but we must, however, hold fast (as Lücke seems to perceive) that both the *reason* and the corresponding *similarity* are together meant, just as in Rom. i. 28. That is however still true which B.-Crusius observes, "καθώς defines *the manner of God's glorification*, through the union of all men (*all?*) in a blessed and sanctified fellowship." So Lampe preferred to

accept the particle as *συγκριτικῶς* seu *ἐξηγητικῶς*. All this harmonises well: the rationem reddere unites both the *reason assigned* and the *object for which*, in as far as, first, the *ἐξουσία* is already attributed and given to the Son, and that, too, not merely as a "commission," but in the fulness of absolute power; —but then only to this end, that He may give life and save. Thus the *καθώς* points not only to the main proposition *ἔδωκας*, but to its subordinate and further scope *ἵνα δώσῃ*. Such is the full meaning of the transition "according as."

All flesh never means unconditionally as such *all men*, and most certainly not here! Gen. vi. 3, 12, connected with it the notion of a dying nature in its full sense as being the result of sin, as well *mortality* as *corruption;* nay, rather, made that its fundamental idea:—though sometimes, as in the case of the flesh of the Logos, the idea of a *weakness* to be overcome is all that is brought into view. See, in illustration, Lu. iii. 6; Isa. xl. 5, 6; Matt. xxiv. 22; Acts ii. 17. His *humiliation* down to the flesh of sinners and the children of death, is contemplated by Him who here prays in the weakness of His flesh but through the power of the eternal Spirit, as itself an *authority* bestowed upon Him:—in this very participation of human nature He has become the Head and the Lord of all humanity. In its final and perfect sense the power of which He speaks was not yet given to Him (see Matt. xxviii. 18)—but we must not, nevertheless, reduce the *ἔδωκας* here to a mere designating, or appointing, or attributing, like the Heb. נָתַן. The full vindication and practical evolution of this power remains for the approaching glorification; but on the ground of the Divinity, which dwelt in and pervaded His humanity, He possessed from the beginning of His incarnation all *ἐξουσία* and *δόξα*. This is the fundamental principle of the whole prayer, as it comes prominently out in this preliminary *καθώς*. In this sense, according to Matt. xi. 27, the Son had already power over *all things;* for that expression, though it primarily referred to things *to be revealed*, yet includes in its meaning the more general and deeper principle of His power. It is the propriety of the Son in His humiliation to have power over all spirits, over every creature, and that power He might use when occasion required; but now that is made prominent which concerns the import of this me-

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA.

diatorial prayer, the specific power over *all flesh*. "That is the foul matter with which Christ has to do. For all flesh is in a miserable condition, so that it might appear to have been made in vain,[1] unless such a Mediator interpose." (Berl. Bibel.) Authority over all flesh, obtained by His becoming a man in the flesh and the Head of our race, the Son received with joy from His Father—"not as a burdensome commission, but as an authority conferred." (Rieger.)

In the word *flesh* there lies involved the "inclusive idea of all tribulation and misery," as Francke rightly preaches. But we doubt very much whether, as Lange assentingly supplements, "in the same expression there is *also* the inclusive idea of all undeveloped human capabilities for the kingdom of God;" for this scriptural phrase, which we have explained upon ch. iii., seems to forbid such a view. Most certainly this material, with which Christ has to do, is not as "flesh" a fund of undeveloped capabilities, but an element of opposition, in a state of ruin and corruption altogether needing renewal. All flesh (excepting Him who even in the flesh has already the ἐξουσία) lies in death, has fallen under the power of *eternal death*: this contrast and gloomy undertone is assuredly presupposed in the fact that a giving of *eternal life* is spoken of as necessary. But even the power of the Son, according to the counsel of the Father, cannot bring to effect the eternal life of *all* flesh: the specific and prominent ἵνα distinguishes His saving power as it respects those given to Him, from the universal authority *over* all men (for this is the right resolution of the genitive here). The latter embraces, as all His working to the end that the whole world if willing may be saved, so also the condemnation which, alas, must be the alternative in the case of the many who will not; but this latter in the High-priestly prayer is merely grazed and passed by, that the salvation of those who believe may be the great theme, ver. 9. The Father *giveth* the power *over* all, but among these all He *giveth* the elect *themselves* to the Son: for here we have the opposition between the general and the particular. It must be understood that the Father hath given those who suffer themselves to be drawn and given: as we have

[1] The thought here reverts to Ps. lxxxix. 48.

sufficiently shown upon ch. vi., and as ver. 8 in this chapter fundamentally establishes.

To become such a *possession* of Jesus (2 Thess. ii. 14)—is ever the condition for the reception of eternal life. "Know this well, O man, that it is not given to thee to be thy own master: thou must have another Lord, the choice is between God and thine eternal enemy and His." (Theremin.) The threefold *giving* has a very significant internal relation, each one strictly proceeding from that which precedes it: because Christ has become the Head of humanity, believers may be given to and incorporated with Him; but to those who become such He can also fully and entirely communicate Himself. And here it must be noted that in a certain sense the honour ultimately rests with the Father alone, who *hath given* to the Son to *give;* while, on the other hand, in the second giving the independent authority of the Son is maintained. Comp. ch. v. 26, according to which the Son *hath* Himself the life, and *is* the life for us. Here then it is that *real* life which is *eternal;* that fellowship with *God* which at once begins with living faith, and is consummated only in the full blessedness of eternal glory:—such must be its meaning here, as it is communicated to us by the *Spirit* through the *glorification* of the Son. Men take needless and foolish pains to take away from this passage all reference to the present state, and eternal life this side the grave; but the opposite error is equally and even more deplorable—that, namely, of limiting it entirely to this state. He who truly hath life in the Son knows also that it will be consummated to him in eternity.

The remarkable construction with πᾶν at the beginning (*enallage* both *generis* and *numeri*—for the reading αὐτῷ, instead of αὐτοῖς, is evidently false), has been spoken of already on ch. vi. 37: all those who are given to the Son are regarded both as individuals, which the αὐτοῖς maintains, and as one complete and foreseen Whole. Thus not merely is πᾶν to be expressed by *quotquot* (with Erasmus), but it is to be regarded as corresponding with the ἵνα ὦσιν ἕν, ver. 11. And this refutes the interpretation of the Berlenb. Bibel (as does also the parallel, ch. vi.),—"That He may give them *all that which* Thou hast given Him, eternal life;" although there is nothing in the expression itself which would oppose this rendering. It evidently aims at

removing anything like an election of those given, and thereby would pave the way for the general restoration of all flesh.

V. 3. Here we have both development and expansion of the thought, by means of a more direct definition of eternal life. The expression is in some sort parallel with ch. iii. 19, And this is the condemnation—thus does it proceed. In that passage, however, the *ground* and the *way* of condemnation are expressly defined; but we must not on that account say that nothing more is meant here than the way to eternal life—This is the appointed way in which men attain to it. For the Lord here penetrates more deeply into the matter than He does there, where it was not yet His purpose to reveal the essential character of the condemnation. The ἐστίν, belonging to the ἵνα γινώσκωσι,[1] is to be understood as in ch. xii. 50 (but not likewise ch. vi. 63, which we have expounded otherwise). It is not needful that the Son should tell the Father in what eternal life consists; hence Francke is very positive that these words were spoken as instruction to those who heard Him, "I have made mention of eternal life, and will now tell *you* how ye may attain it." This, however, is too peremptory, and forgets that the ὁμολόγησις also is part of true prayer—Father, I know Thee, Thou art the only God, to know Thee is life! We have an apt parallel in Wisd. xv. 3—so apt that we might almost suppose an allusion to it—For to know Thee is perfect righteousness; yea, to know Thy power is the root of immortality. Even this apocryphal passage,—anticipating the New Testament, though the ἐπίστασθαι and the ῥίζα ἀθανασίας reach not the depth of the γινώσκειν and the ζωὴ αἰώνιος—goes beyond the superficial meaning which many, with a good intention or in condescending apologetics, derive from this utterance of our Lord. Erskine,[2] to wit: "The mystery of eternal life, holiness and blessedness, consist in the knowledge of the moral attributes of God, as they have been manifested in the work of Jesus Christ." [Germ. trans.] O no, it is not the attributes or perfections of God which are here referred to merely, but the κράτος or essence of

[1] A various reading has the indicative. Certainly ἵνα is the explicative ὅτι; not *in order that*, which by an inconceivable ὕστερον πρότερον, the eternal life would come before the knowledge of God and of Christ.

[2] Essay on Faith, translated by Krüger.

the eternal Power and Godhead itself, the most internal principle of which is the power of communicating love as the root of our eternal life. Schmieder unexpectedly explains at first, that Jesus does not declare *in what* eternal life consists, but what would make eternal life accessible to us, in what and whereby we may attain eternal life; but he afterward corrects himself, "In this *knowledge*, however, we *have* Him and in Him eternal life; for true knowledge is ever communication of influence, and leads to increasingly perfect fellowship."[1] Yes, in truth, this saying may serve to explain what *knowledge* means in Scripture! 1 Cor. viii. 2, 3, xiii. 12; Gal. iv. 9. Not apprehension, imagination, thinking in cold speculation, or feeling in the unillumined warmth of false mysticism; nor is it belief as mere admission and credence, but a living, conscious possession of fellowship with Him. *To know God*—the highest thing possible to the creature, or for which the creature was formed! When *that* is perfect, the *life* is consummate. The holy angels are from their creation blessed in this, that they behold the face of God; but we are to *receive* the knowledge of the only true God (which not more than eternal life we derive from ourselves), through Him whom He hath sent to us to that end.

God is ὁ ἀληθινὸς θεός, that is not, certainly, "who faithfully fulfils His promises"—but He alone is God in the only true and absolutely real meaning of this incomprehensible name; a name which humanity never lost sight of even in its darkest idolatry, as in 1 Thess. i. 9, θεὸς ζῶν καὶ ἀληθινός. There is manifestly here a similar contrast with the "gods" falsely so called: this is proved by the corroborative μόνος, as well as by the juxtaposition of Jesus the Messiah, which gives a peculiar character to this passage. The two opposites to the knowledge of the true God here referred to, were in their historical manifestation at that time—*Gentile* idolatry, which knew not nor acknowledged even the one true God; and the *Jewish* rejection of His anointed in the person of Jesus, which nevertheless acknowledged and professed to know the only God—see, however, ch. v. 37, 38, viii. 42, 43, 54, 55. But in their internal

[1] As Iren. adv. Hær. iv. 20, Ἡ ὕπαρξις τῆς ζωῆς ἐκ τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ περιγίνεται μετοχῆς· μετοχὴ δὲ θεοῦ ἐστι τὸ γινώσκειν θεὸν καὶ ἀπολαύειν τῆς χρηστότητος αὐτοῦ.

and permanent principle, as the Lord here points to it for all futurity, they are—*Pantheistic* denial of the personal supermundane Creator, and deification of the creature which is the root of all heathenism; and *Deistical* rationalism, which needs not and rejects Christ. We may regard this juxtaposition under various aspects, as history and experience furnish illustrations of its meaning. On the one hand, Christ alone is the way to the Father, and there is no knowledge of the Father apart from and independently of the Son whom He hath sent to us: and in this sense the *καί* is a profound explication of what precedes. And this holds good with regard to all conscious and wilful rejection of the Christ who is come, in which alienation from God and hatred to Him must infallibly manifest themselves.[1] But, on the other hand, since the whole truth in man's relations to God comes out only step by step, since men can be brought back to a knowledge of God only *by degrees*, the two parts of our saying express this progression, as it corresponds on a great scale to the relation between the Old and New Testaments—Repentance toward God and faith in Jesus Christ.[2] Assuredly, there have been and there are monotheist Jews (as even Mohammedans and Gentile Philosophers), who already possess some knowledge of the *μόνος ἀληθινὸς θεός*, and yet know not Christ; but this *partial* knowledge must necessarily be connected with partial life. Among these must we place, to speak in the mildest terms, such Rationalists as not altogether without their own fault tarry long in the outer court, who, as *halfthinkers* (like the Jews going not beyond their preparatory half-knowledge of the Old Testament), hold a personal God without Christ. In the case of some of them, those whose hearts are sincere, the mystical Christ may be unconsciously possessed as the long-suffering Angel of the Covenant; but in the case of those who persist to the uttermost in conscious opposition to the influence of Revelation, it comes at last to

[1] He who can *hate* God who is eternal love, absolutely knoweth Him not.

[2] "To take the Lord for our God is the natural part of the covenant; the supernatural part is, to take Christ for our Redeemer. The former is first necessary, and implied in the latter." Baxter's Saint's Rest, Fawcett's Abridgment, p. 81.

what is written—He that hath not the Son, hath not God![1] Repentance itself is first made perfect and confirmed in faith toward Christ; the full understanding of the monotheist foundation, בְּרֵאשִׁית בָּרָא, comes to the *whole-thinker* first in ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος—which again the Spirit of the Son, who became flesh and was then glorified, brought to light out of the rubbish of inquiring philosophy.

Many, from the earliest times, not content with the simple accusative of the persons after the emphatic γινώσκωσι, have therefore sought to introduce some abstraction as the object of the knowledge. Hence even Luther's paraphrase—*That* Thou alone art the true God; although he is inconsistent with himself in the second clause, in which he does not similarly continue. A superficial exposition, however, has done so, and we find Freilinghausen and Francke correcting Luther with all confidence by adding—And Jesus *as* the Christ, that He is Christ. So, *e.g.*, Clericus, Wolle, Nösselt, Kuinoel, Meyer, and Lücke, formerly. Kling, on the contrary, observes very properly, "*according to the sense* this 'acknowledge *as*,' may be admitted (we would say rather, according to the primary sense); but *grammatically* it can be resolved only thus, To know Thee, who art the only true God, and Jesus *who is the Messiah*." (So also Lampe.) This, then, would interpret as if there were an εἶναι in the passage. But the meaning is by no means thus exhausted, and Tholuck says again, "Not to mention other reasons against it, the *article* ought not to be wanting to Χριστός, just as we find it in ch. xx. 31." J. M. Faber assumed such an εἶναι, but with another application in the second clause —*And Jesus Christ to be He whom Thou hast sent.* Stolz translates, "And as Thy Sent One." Lücke afterward adopted this, on the ground that Ἰησοῦς Χριστός together is in St John a proper name, the predicative term of dignity, Χριστός being not indeed altogether lost sight of, but sunk in the proper name. This view is the clearest to all the pseudo-friends of light—as we see in the case of Stolz himself—because they

[1] "In the soul of every unregenerate man *the creature is both God and Christ.* As turning from the creature to God, and not by Christ, is no true turning (that is, no whole turning)—so believing in Christ, while the creature hath our hearts, is no true believing." Baxter, as before.

would place in connection with the only true *God* no more than a *man* sent by Him.[1] But we shall presently see that all this does not penetrate to the kernel of this wonderful saying. It does, indeed, permit such preliminary acceptations to the weak and sincere, *because the Lord's wisdom and love does not lay down such stiff and rigid symbola as His Church too often does*, but to all truly sincere seekers it approves on deeper investigation the equal Godhead of the Son.

The equal Godhead of Him who was sent? And here too, where the God who sent Him is placed in conjunction with Him as the *only* true God? This is the taunting question of too many in our day, who triumphantly pervert this sacred word of the prayer of Jesus into their own Rationalist symbol. But let us look at it more closely! At the outset, it is by no means established, as these people suppose, that μόνος stands here as excluding and opposed to Him who was sent; it is, indeed, open to question whether this μόνος is to be construed into predicate or subject. Pater est *unus verus Deus—Pater solus* est verus Deus, are two propositions wide as the heavens asunder. Have we not already shown, by the significant antithesis to the heathenish and pantheist multiplication of gods and deification of all things, that the μόνος as strictly connected with ἀληθινός must be a *predicate?* Thus Clemens, ad Cor. Epist. i. understood it, when he wrote, with allusion to this passage, Thus He acted, in order to the glorification of the name of the true and only God. And so does the Peschito expressly translate, אַנת אֱלָהָא דַשְׁרָרָא בַּלְחוּדָיִךְ. The *sole, personal God*, as opposed to all the multiplicity of so-called אֱלֹהִים, as well as to all creaturely צְבָאוֹת of heaven and earth:—this is the fundamental truth of Scripture; and it is not abolished, but rather unfolded, by the doctrine of the Trinity, so that we no longer regard the μόνος as an abstract and dead unity. Comp. the μόνος, Rom. xvi. 27; 1 Tim. i. 17; and even Matt. xix. 17, εἷς—etc. It was simple infatuation, and nothing more, which led Crellius in the Tract. de uno Deo Patre, p. 2, to declare Jno. xvii. 3 to be *the first testimony and argument of his opinion.* But how are we to

[1] Lücke, however, does not make common cause with them, since he adds the caution, "But both predicate and subject are embraced as the one object of the γινώσκειν."

understand the words, so as to retain in them the doctrine of the equal Divinity of Jesus Christ, as it is contained in the whole of Scripture, and in this entire prayer?

Many of the Fathers, as Augustine,[1] Ambrose, and Hilary, referred the predicate τὸν μόνον κ.τ.λ. to both the Persons named, and assumed Jesus Christ to be included therein, connecting the καί and the σέ closely together. Not otherwise Chrys. and Euthymius, who expressly supplement an εἶναι, to which the καί would likewise belong. This was well-meaning and conformable to the truth; but it scarcely needs to be shown that it was an enforced and untenable exegesis, as Lampe clearly perceived. Nevertheless, Christ is by no means excluded here from the Godhead, but is positively united in one with the Father. The grounds of this assertion are these:—

First: The counter-proof from the apparent meaning of the words, even if the μόνος excludes only false Gods, avails not as an *argumentum a silentio*, since Christ here speaks *primarily* of His human person and nature. It runs—Whom Thou hast sent; not—Whom Thou hast *begotten!* And very appropriately so: for this latter mystery is not to be *known* in the sense in which the word here holds; nor does eternal life depend (as the Athanasian Creed too boldly says) upon our accepting the Trinitarian mysteries, with or without understanding. Rapp and all his brother Rationalists are right in this. Christ does actually *pray* here, consequently not as God to Himself. Lampe: Nunquam magis fas erat, ut Pater, contra distincte ad Filium, in hac σχέσει Filio obversaretur, quam in præsenti occasione, cum coram throno Patris in humili illâ formâ tanquam servus obediens adstaret—cumque ita etiam impleret prophetarum oracula, qui eum precando Patrem pro *Deo suo* agnoscentem introduxerant. Berlenb. Bibel: "Two main points are the keys to this whole prayer. 1. That Christ presents Himself in His official character before the Father in the deepest humiliation, yet as a Person intimately near to the Father. 2. That the economy of the Father and that of the Son are exhibited in their perfect harmony." Yes verily, in

[1] De Spirit. et litera, cap. 22, where he speaks of vivere de Deo, apud quem est fons vitæ, and cites this passage thus: *id est*, te et quem misisti Jesum Christum [cognoscant] unum verum Deum.

the humiliation of one who prays He is yet a Person intimately near; so near, that the prayer passes in the *Thou* and in the *We* into the colloquy of an equal—as we shall see. Is not this of itself enough?

But secondly: How *could* the Son as a creature be the glorifier of the Father, the Mediator and Giver of life to all flesh; how *could* He as such *place Himself by the side of* the Father by a strictly parallel accusative? Luther says forcibly and truly, "He mixes and blends Himself in the same sole Divine essence, authority, and power; for He will be acknowledged equally with the Father as the giver of eternal life." It is the same juxtaposition as in ch. xiv. 1; concerning which—blasphemous for every creature, but appropriate to the Son—we have already spoken enough on that passage. The babblers who find here *no more than* a praying mortal, have but a very slight perception of what the prerogative of God's honour *above* every praying creature demands. Was not Moses *sent* of God, and many others like him? But how would it run, Eternal life and blessedness consists in this, to know God and Moses—or God *and Paul!* But He who prays here thus absolutely speaks *Himself* to God—To know *Thee and Me!* As neither the Archangel Gabriel nor Michael could present himself before the throne of his Creator with the words which precede and which follow these—Glorify me, that I may glorify Thee! I have glorified Thee, *and now* glorify Thou me!—no more could he presume upon such a juxtaposition as is found here in ver. 3.

Thirdly: We now cannot but see that that preliminary acceptation—To know *Thee* as God, Me *as* Christ or *as* sent of Thee—does not by any means satisfy the meaning of the words. For eternal life cannot be regarded as flowing from the knowledge of the office and work of a man, cannot consist immediately in that *just as* it does in the knowledge of the living God. Therefore, in the second clause also, the γινώσκειν is certainly spoken of the *Person*, not of His teaching or work. Luther here misses the point, "Hence the force lies in the little word *Thee*, that they may know Thee. Whom? Thee, who hast sent Jesus Christ!" For, it is not σὲ τὸν ἀποστείλαντά με—but, καὶ ὃν ἀπέστειλας. This Person sent, however, is the same

who in ch. x. 30 said ἕν ἐσμεν. Thus the inmost and true object of the knowledge transcends the predicates Christ and Sent, and can be found only in the subject of these predicates, One with the only God. According to 1 John v. 20, where οὗτος incontrovertibly refers to the Son, Jesus Christ, He also is the true God and eternal life. Does this then render necessary two ἀληθινοὶ θεοί, or does not the μόνος retain notwithstanding its propriety? In St Jude's Epistle, ver. 4, Christ is termed ὁ μόνος δεσπότης καὶ κύριος—in ver. 25 we have again μόνῳ θεῷ. Does not all this consist well together, on the presupposition of the Trinitarian unity? As in that most simple Apostles' Creed *before* the Apostles' Creed, 1 Cor. viii. 6, we may ask—Is therefore the Father not also *Lord?* So here—Is therefore the Son not also *God?*[1]

Fourthly, and finally: We have only to connect this verse, instead of wresting it as an isolated saying, I say not with the entire Scripture, nor with the whole of this Gospel from its prologue downward, but with the whole of the prayer in which it is found, in order to be constrained to admit the full force of its testimony! Does the Lord here pray only as one sent unto men, like other men, with an office and work to fulfil? At the outset, in ver. 1, the eternal *Son* comes into the presence of the Father boldly and as an equal—in ver. 5 He speaks of His eternal existence with God, before the world was—consequently, ἐξῆλθον in ver. 8 is the profounder interpretation of the ἀπέστειλας—then see ver. 10—and still rising higher, ἡμεῖς, ver. 11, ἡμῖν ver. 21—in ver. 22, ἡμεῖς ἕν ἐσμεν—and all in this one prayer, uttered before His death! There is but one interpretation of ver. 3 which harmonises with all this, and it is that which we have given. Olshausen had no right to say that "this verse cannot be used *as a proof-passage* (for the Divinity of Christ)," especially as he afterward in part corrects himself, and speaks more to the point. It is a proof-passage, and that not merely *consequentially*, as it is said, but by the force of the most rigid exegesis. Lücke, too, speaks inexactly, "The passage is neither Trinitarian nor anti-Trini-

[1] Quod si unus Deus pater Christo non adimit ut unus sit Dominus, ita solus Deus Pater verus Christo Jesu non aufert, ut verus Deus sit. Hilar. de Trin. lib. ix.

tarian, because its standing-point is not the idea of the Logos, but the historical manifestation of Jesus Christ." This last is partly true; but the passage is made only the more convincingly Trinitarian by the fact that this Jesus Christ does nevertheless in this way "mix and blend His own being with that sole eternal Godhead."

We have left to the last a tremendous difficulty which some have found for themselves; a difficulty which many of our readers, both simple and thoughtful, would hardly be able to discover or even believe unless it were told them. The Lord, in His Father's presence and speaking of Himself, mentions His two names, that of His person and of His office—*Jesus Christ!* These people, and we do not envy or disturb them, find in this incontrovertible evidence that the whole is nothing more than a composition of the Evangelist John. Even Lücke, however, who scarcely more than *tolerated* the third person in the solemn style of prayer, as it has occurred previously, now joins these opponents in regarding the *Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν* as "*intolerable.*" He does not scruple even to approve Bretschneider's *lapsus est auctor*, cum e suo ingenio scriberet! With all respect for the learned Doctor, not Bretschneider but Lücke, we cannot refrain from uttering our testimony that such an expression as this, and the critical assumption of judgment upon the Apostle and the Evangelist John from which it springs, is itself, to say the least, *intolerable.* What possible notion, in God's name, of the relation of the Evangelist to the Holy Spirit, and of His assistance in the preservation of *this prayer* for the Church, must the man have who can reconcile with it such a *lapsus* as would scarcely befall the most insignificant author, or to whom such a *lapsus* would in itself be *endurable?* Did not the blessed Evangelist take sufficient pains in revising his manuscript, and thus suffer to go forth uncorrected to the world such an "offence against historical propriety" (as de Wette calls it)?—The matter is simple enough, if we would take the pains to investigate and pause before we pronounce our absolute decisions. True it is that this *Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν* in the lips of Jesus Himself is striking, indeed it stands here alone in its kind; but it is on that account all the more impressive, and appropriately in its place. After the Lord in vers. 1, 2 (before He comes to

the *Ἐγώ* of ver. 4) had already most solemnly, *with as much lowliness as dignity*, spoken of Himself, the Son, in the third person, this *self-objectivising*—the lower analogies of which we have in so many psalm-prayers of the servant, as of the king—*progresses* in ver. 3 into a perfect self-designation, because here the *γινώσκειν* is to have its object exhibited in the Person of Him who is elevated to equality with God, and as such is to be from this time presented to the world, even as He now presents Himself as such to the Father. With him who does not *feel* this, we have no contention. This "Jesus Christ" is said to have been derived, as an expression of John himself, from his prologue, ch. i. 17;—but why may we not reverse the proposition, since the disciples must learn first of the Master, how to speak of Him?

This is, indeed, the only time that the Lord Himself unites thus simply and immediately His Christ-name with His Jesus-name;—but the occasion stands alone. He presents Himself, in the presence of His listening disciples, before the Father in the most sublime self-testimony; uttering that designation of Himself which was *thereby* sanctified, instituted, and ordained for all future testimony to His person. And we may say that the apostolical custom of using *Jesus Christ* as one double appellative, making *Χριστός* also a proper name, had its origin in this word of our Lord. Speak of Him as He spoke of Himself before God—this was the Spirit's suggestion to their minds. The Lord here confirms, unfolds, explains, and glorifies the central word of the Old Testament, now fulfilled in Him; avows in the most solemn manner before the Father that He, Jesus, this Son of man and Son of God, sent and proceeding from the Father, and who now advances to His death, is the *μόνος ἀληθινὸς Χριστός*—the *only true Messiah;* but He thereby also *protests against* and annihilates *every false notion of the Messiah*, as in the former clause *every false God.* Still more: He reveals and sets His conclusive seal to what was scarcely recognised at all in Israel—that *Χριστός* and *υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ* really *coincide and are synonymous.* Is not this of itself enough to justify the use of this language as most appropriate? In the *ἀπέστειλας* is thus latent the *ἐξῆλθον παρὰ τοῦ πατρός*, in the *Χριστός* we now see that *υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ* is included—for, to

repeat the question, how otherwise could the knowledge of this Christ, alike with the knowledge of God, be eternal life? Let it now be observed that, in 1 Jno. v. 1, for example, it is merely said, *whoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ;* but this immediately afterwards in ver. 5 alternates with *He that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God.* And a locus classicus like this of the highest dignity, which establishes and teaches us how to understand the formula of the whole New Testament, is to be explained as a marvellous *lapsus auctoris*, a reduction into its original source of a formula which existed without any such high and solemn reason! Finally, if it is the personal name *Jesus* which is the really "intolerable" thing, as being uttered by Jesus Himself, we have only to remark that all which had preceded gives ample justification of its use, as inseparably belonging to that formula of testimony to His own person in which the Lord here prototypically presents Himself before the Father and the world. For the rest, we would quote Lampe once more, whose words must have their full weight: "Not to no purpose is it that the Lord does not simply say *Me*, but speaks of Himself in the third person; commemorating Himself *His own proper name*, in order that He may intimate the *mystical meaning which it involves.*" Or is it a fortuitous and meaningless thing that the Son of Mary was called *Jesus?* This *name of salvation* (Lu. ii. 21), first uttered by Gabriel, which combines a *name* common among the people with the sole and incomparable truth of its *signification*, which was borne in the Old Testament by typical persons, which in apostolical preaching is expounded even as the angel of the Lord had expounded it (Acts iv. 12, v. 31; Matt. i. 21)—is it not here, if anywhere, fittingly used, where He who bears it presents Himself before the Father *in the full consciousness* of its power and meaning?[1]

Vers. 4, 5. To have the authority and power to save, according to the meaning of His name,[2] to give eternal life in the

[1] And was it not something affectingly belonging to the *joy of His departure*, that the Spirit should impress upon Him in all its clearness and blessedness the encouraging truth—Thou art called *Jesus*, for Thou shalt save Thy people from their sins! Thus St Matthew's record of the *conception*, and St John's of the *departure*, coincide in *the name of Jesus.*

[2] Ecclus. xlvi. 1, ὅς ἐγένετο κατὰ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ μέγας ἐπὶ σωτηρίᾳ ἐκ-

living knowledge of Himself and through Him of the Father—this is the joy and the crown of His *Jesus-heart* at the present point of transition in His prayer, as He approaches the Father with the *name of Jesus*, that this name also may be *glorified* with and in Him. But eternal life is the fruit and consequence of His glorification, which rests upon the fulfilment of His redeeming *mediatorial work*:—He therefore proceeds to speak of this, developing and establishing it more fully. They are greatly in error, although there are many orthodox men among them, who would understand by the work merely the *teaching office* of Jesus. Albertini, *e.g.*, says incorrectly in his sermon, "To have happily finished His office of teaching was to Him a great thing—but He presently thinks of the mighty *arrears* of His work, and prays that the Father would glorify Him again through the suffering of death." We saw so far back as ch. iv. that the great seedtime and harvest were anticipated and united proleptically in one—and can we suppose Him *here* to have spoken less comprehensively? He expressly describes the work *upon earth*, as if He was already lifted up from the earth, and looking back upon it from heaven; the spirit of prayer so elevates Him that He can say in ver. 11—I am no more in the world! Ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς is indeed the antithesis to παρὰ σεαυτῷ, παρὰ σοί, that is, in Thy heaven. (Bengel: terra defecerat a Deo.) Had He not already suffered upon earth, and were not the sufferings of death the final consummation of His human life in humility? Thus the ἐτελείωσα (τελειώσας is an unworthy substitution) is an anticipation, like the *I have overcome* of ch. xvi. 33, which gives its predominant tone to the entire prayer. In this *finished*, before the fulfilment upon the cross,[1] consists the pre-eminent wonder of this prayer, which anticipates the heavenly mediation and intercession. The great *Remain-*

λεκτῶν αὐτοῦ. Let not the Apocrypha be too much despised; it contains many preludes and echoes of the Spirit of prophecy, and some remarkably seeming to go beyond the limits of the canonical writings. Throughout the praises of the Fathers in Ecclesiasticus, it is in the case of Abraham and Solomon alone that the signification of the name is lightly touched—Why is it then that in the case of Joshua it is made so strikingly prominent? The Bible closes, Rev. xxii. 16–20, with the single name Jesus; ver. 21 being all that is added.

[1] See the Apostle's fainter echo in 2 Tim. iv. 6–8.

der, of which Albertini speaks, is not the suffering of death as such, for that also is merged in the victory of eternal life, but the glorification with the Father Himself in heaven, as it is here simply expressed. And even that is not so much in reserve, as now assigned and already His own, even while He befittingly prays for it; for in ver. 10 we find a δεδόξασμαι, in vers. 22, 24 the δόξα which was already given to Him. We observed before that there is not even a *thanksgiving* at the end of the finished prayer, and that is true; for the avowal and testimony before God—Thou gavest Me the power, Thou gavest Me all to whom I give eternal life; and now again—*Thou gavest* Me the work to do! is something different from and more than thanksgiving in the sense of the children of men. But previous to this honour assigned to the Father, comes the equally valid honour and dignity of the Son—*I have finished the work*, and thereby *glorified Thy name, and now glorify Me!* Once more, who might thus speak before the throne of the μεγαλοπρεπὴς δόξα (2 Pet. i. 17)—except the eternal Son, well-pleasing to the Father, and well-beloved of Him in His humanity? More is expressed in this καὶ νῦν—indicating in itself the hour which had come (Euthymius)—than merely, "the interchange of love," as Olshausen thinks, needlessly seeking to do away with any idea of compensating reward. We dare not say that the praying Son regarded that as only a reciprocation of love which in the presence of the holy and righteous Father was really the crown set upon His worthiness. Heb. ii. 9; Phil. ii. 9. But even the Son is in this ἐδόξασα and ἐτελείωσα perfectly conscious of His own worthiness and merit.[1]—"He founds this petition upon His obedience," as Braune says, and as Theophylact, in this better than Euthymius, expounds it in almost the same words. We must receive this as the most sacred earnestness of scriptural teaching, and take it as our own strong consolation; not sentimentally robbing it of all its meaning, as for instance Herder irreverently does, to the scandal of the devout, when he writes concerning this prayer, "That which Christ regarded as the most precious booty of His short earthly life, for which he thanked God as

[1] See what has been already said, upon ch. xiii. 32.

His richest gain, is His wreath and recompence in that world, an unfading heavenly flower of friendship!!" Here, if anywhere, is such aesthetic sentimentality loathsome and out of place.

It is necessary to observe carefully that the object of this *glorify*—*μέ*—as it comes into close connection with the *σὺ πάτερ*, is by no means merely the *humanity*,[1] any more than it is the eternal Godhead of the Son in itself; but the entire Person of the God-man as one. If He referred to Himself simply as man, how could He say that He already *had* this glory before the world was? If He referred simply to Himself as the Son of God, what would be the giving again of a glory which had never been essentially laid aside or given up? To deduce from these words, with Thomasius and others, the doctrine that even the Divine nature was the subject of *exinanitio*, is—whatever value such speculations may have in their place—to travel beyond the simple meaning of our text, which knows nothing of any such separation and distinction in the consciousness of Jesus. The *glorifying* which He here arrogates is to be understood only as the correlative of the *κρύψις* and *κένωσις* involved in the taking flesh, and which had now come to an end in this *νῦν*. In the *glorify Me* the humanity remains entire, yea, in the integrity even of flesh and blood, as we saw in ch. vi.; it is not such a return to the Father, such an assumption again by the Father, as would involve the forsaking His flesh as well as the world. For He prays, or rather desires, Take now this humanity, in which I have accomplished the work, also into heaven with Thee—thither, where My Divinity hath been from all eternity. The two natures and persons of the *ἐγὼ ἐτελείωσα* and the *εἶχον* are inseparably united in *δόξασόν με*. Christ prayed that id, quod tum filius hominis est, ad perfectum Dei filium, *i.e.* ad resumendam indulgendamque *corpori* æternitatis suæ gloriam, per resurrectionis (et ascensionis!) potentiam gigneretur; quam gloriam a Patre corporeus reposcebat. Non nova quærit, *non aliena desiderat;* esse talis qualis fuerat, postulat, sed precatur: id se, quod antea erat, esse, gigni scilicet ad id, quod suum fuit.[2] It

[1] As most of the fathers have carelessly said, such as Hilary, Chrys., Theodor. Heracl., and Mopsu., Augustine, Theophylact, Euthymius.

[2] Hilar. Tract. in Ps. ii. c. 27. See in Dorner, Entwickelungsgeschichte, S. 1063.

is as if in this παρὰ σεαυτῷ He had approached the Father with the language of the Psalm—Set Me at Thy right hand! "The *incarnate* Son now takes His part in glory, returns in a glorified human form to God; the Son of God and the Son of man are for ever united in Jesus, as the almighty and yet human Ruler of the universe. It is the same pure *I* which had been from all eternity in glory with God, and which *became in time cognisable in Jesus;* this I, this personality, was once only in the Son of God, but since the ascension it has existed in Divine majesty in the God-man." (Fikenscher.)

It may be hoped that this will help us to understand the εἶχον concerning which Bengel says—hic non dicit *accepi*, "He does not say, *which I received.*" The Socinians of old and recently cease not to refer this to the Divine counsel and predetermination;[1] B.-Crus., after Wetstein, Nösselt, Gabler, etc., reasserts the old *destinatum habere*, as involved either in the ἔχειν, or even (as Eckermann will have it!) in the παρὰ σοί—in Thy counsel and mind! To that humble and believing spirit which instinctively recoils from all wresting of Scripture, it is an offence even to refute such interpretations. It may be thought that even Augustine bordered upon it[2]—but in *his* case it is only in appearance; he does no more than needlessly discriminate between the Lord's Divinity and humanity. Indeed, he is so far right as the eternal ἔχειν of the Divine nature must be regarded as having *prædestinando* extended itself also to the human.

Παρὰ σοί, finally, belongs per synchysin to the εἶχον, as the Syr. translates, הֲוָא לִי לְוָתָךְ מִן קֳדָם דְּנַהֲוֵא עָלְמָא. The intermediate clause—before the world was—is by no means an accommodated expression, describing an extra-temporal eternity in a popular manner and according to human notions,—as some are contented with thinking, who do not perceive the massive weight of all

[1] Grotius: habebam—destinatione tua! *Sic* legem ante mundum aiunt fuisse Hebræi! But even Episcopius, as Tholuck quotes him, saw that then—Christ would have said nothing more of Himself than what any man might say.

[2] Intelligamus prædestinationem claritatis humanæ, quæ in illo est, naturæ, ex mortali immortalis apud Patrem futuræ, et hoc jam prædestinando factum fuisse antequam mundus esset, quod in mundo etiam suo tempore fieret. Tract. cv. 7.

such words as these.[1] Creation in time is by no means of itself a mere human notion, but the Lord here confirms this first-dogma of Scripture by the clearest utterance of His own consciousness. In *πρὸ τοῦ τὸν κόσμον* (that is, here, *τὴν κτίσιν*) *εἶναι* everything creaturely is excluded, and upon this foundation is then built the most emphatic *παρὰ σοί*—With Thee in eternity before the beginning of the world and of time. Bengel: quia tum extra Deum nil erat. Even Hippolytus, constrained by this word, was obliged to say, "For He was ever in the excellent glory, coexisting with the Father of whom He was begotten before the ages, before time, and before the foundation of the world." If there was nothing then *extra Deum*, the Son was *θεός*, but at the same time, however, as Son *πρὸς τὸν θεόν*, *in the bosom* of the Father. This hypostatical distinction in the unity of nature is expressed here also in the *παρά*. Thus it is not as the heretic Marcellus of Ancyra thought, "*Nothing else was beside God alone*, and the *Λόγος* before the creation of the world lay in the Father only *δυνάμει*, as *ἐνέργεια δραστικὴ πράξεως*, thus being simply one with Him, as being no other than a possibility in Himself." For the Lord says *παρὰ σοί* with reference to the *σὺ πάτερ*; He therefore carries back the name *Son*, which the incarnation had made prominent, even to His eternal pre-existence before the world was:—He thus permits and obliges us to recognize the mystery of an eternal Sonship in Him who was begotten before all worlds.

This *πρὸ τοῦ τὸν κόσμον εἶναι* (comp. Ps. xc. 2) corresponds with the *ἀρχή before* the *πάντα ἐγένετο*. Here, not simply as the Vulg. translates, priusquam mundus *fieret*, but priusquam *esset*. In ver. 24 afterwards we find instead *πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου*, a well-known and frequently occurring phrase, see Matt. xiii. 35, xxv. 34; Lu. xi. 50; Eph. i. 4; 1 Pet. i. 20; Heb. iv. 3. If only on this account no one should undertake to say that *κόσμος* here in ver. 5 is only the world of earth and men, as in ver. 6 and subsequently.[2] But there is here the same transition

[1] Hiller: As a child is taught that the little brook which it looks into is derived from the ocean, and returns to it.

[2] Schmieder reckons the word "world" nineteen times in the prayer, this being the first; but he forgets to remark that this *first time* it has a peculiar signification, which does not recur till ver. 24.

from the general to the particular as in the Prologue from *all things were made by Him* to *the world was made by Him*. In Heb. i. 2 and xi. 3 we find τοὺς αἰῶνας. Καταβάλλεσθαι means to lay the foundation; to fix, establish, begin, with and without θεμέλιον. (Heb. vi. 1.) Καταβολή is the foundation or establishment in being, which meaning is to be preferred even in Heb. xi. 11 to that other—see Gen. iv. 25 (Sept.). Compare Job xxxviii. 4; Ps. xxiv. 2, etc.[1] And now let every one submit to hear this most plain and irresistible expression of the *self-consciousness of Christ in the presence of His Father* (not merely "the Apostle's self-consciousness"), in which He testifies in prayer His own pre- and extra-temporal existence with the Father before all εἶναι of any κόσμος, any κτίσις.[2] This Divine εἶναι πρό may, for the rest, be termed (with Ebrard) "an eternal, dynamic *Prius* in relation to the creation of the temporal universe"—this all the more firmly establishes it that this *creation* of time and the world is the *beginning* of that time. Men may deal with all other passages of Scripture which teach a creation in time as if they consisted of mere human representations, and dogmatical forms of teaching, beneath which deeper principles lie, for the research of speculation—though not one of them is so handled without injustice; but here we would appeal to the inextinguishable feeling of truth in the mind of every speculatist, and ask if in the consciousness of Christ this πρό did not express a real and literal truth.

Certain it is that to *distinguish* the *eternal* Son from the *temporal world* created through Him, the πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως from the κτίσις (of which a false exposition of this word would make him part!)—to *apprehend* how He is ἄχρονος and yet not ἄναρχος (this heretical expression being *rightly* interpreted)—is a goal of our knowledge which is unattainable in this state. All speculation which has striven to attain satisfaction upon this point, in the present state, and by its own thinking, has resulted in confusion, confounding for the most part the Son

[1] Thus the mystico-theosophical interpretation of καταβολή as connected with the Fall of the angels, which Feldhoff's Paragraphen zur Geschichte suggest is altogether contrary to the meaning of the word.

[2] And that, if we add ver. 24, as the eternal object of His *love*. Compare the remarks upon this most weighty saying in Liebner's Christologie i. 155.

and the universe. The בְּרֵאשִׁית בָּרָא, as the first and last word of Scripture, is embraced and held fast only by *faith*. In Heb. xi. 3, it is *πίστει νοοῦμεν*, not *γνώσει ἐπιγινώσκομεν*. Rothe's theological speculation—and this is the most recent example—has not steered clear of the error of heathenish and natural thinking, which knows of nothing but an eternal world which must be blended in its *Ὄν* with God; and into this error must *all* speculation run which does not content itself with the *γνῶσις ἐν πίστει*.[1] For ourselves, we would accept the challenge which he throws out, and test the results of such speculation by the canon of *Scripture*. We ask, can there be any such thing as a canonical Scripture, if "the difference between the popular presentation of the matter which prevails in the Bible, and the more rigorously scientific ideas which speculative theology demands," is to be accepted in such a sense as to make the word of God reveal a beginning, when there could have been none, and the Son of God speak of a "*before* the world," when any such *before* is inconceivable and impossible. We ask whether the consciousness of Jesus, uttering itself in this Highpriestly Prayer in expressions so definite and plain, is to be represented as merely a concession to the habit of uncultivated thought which requires a "temporal priority of God before the world," in order to the maintenance of His "priority as the First Cause." *To us* the answer is obvious. We would not in our thoughts and words go beyond or differ from the thoughts and words of Christ Himself; we would think, as the Spirit of God has taught multitudes of thinkers both before Christ and since, both of an actual creation and an actual Creator. We maintain that the Son of God in humanity declares here a beginning of the world; and this one word—*before the world was*—yea, the little word

[1] His process of creation is simply the process by which God the Spirit becomes the world; a process, too, which has no completion or limit. He boldly maintains that "*the notion of a creation in time is altogether untenable*, nor should we shrink any longer from admitting the eternity and imperishableness of creation." He maintains that creating and being a Creator essentially lie in the idea of God; that the transition from not creating to creating would inevitably involve a change in God. "In the beginning—the first moment of time"—in relation to Him (notwithstanding Gen. i. 1; Jno. i. 1), is not conceivable! And matter as pure matter is like God without beginning, etc. See his Ethik i. S. 98 ff.

before itself, condemns all speculation which denies it;—all speculation, that is, which takes a ground independent of scriptural revelation, and would evolve its so-called idea of God out of its own creaturely consciousness of the *εἶναι*, or "absolute pure being." The everlasting distinction between the eternal Creator and the temporal creature, as it is established by the *revealed* word concerning the *only true God*, is irremovably fixed to the *consciousness of faith;* and the philosophers should learn a lesson from the fact that they can never make their notions intelligible to those who cherish a simple and living faith.

This may be enough upon the little word *before*. But now we must regard the verse under another point of view, and say something in refutation of a certain doctrine which imagines the Son of God, existing before His incarnation, to have become an angel from the beginning of the creation.[1] This hypothesis assumes that what is here, Jno. xvii. 5 (and elsewhere) said *cannot be referred* to the inalienable glory of the uncreated *Logos*. But we do not see why it cannot, provided we seize the twofold relation in the *δόξασόν με* and the *εἶχον* in its unity:—to have a proper view of this is necessary for the right understanding of all the attributes of the Divine and human person of Christ. Why might not the God-man as man, consequently also *as God-man*, be again glorified with the glory which He, the same God-man, that is, the same *I before the world was* which has *now* entered into humanity, *had* already as the eternal Son? If the assumption of the nature of the first-created angel were in the background of these words, the *πρὸ τοῦ τὸν κόσμον εἶναι* would not retain its literal truth (since this *πρωτότοκος, ἀρχὴ τῆς κτίσεως*, Rev. iii. 14, so understood, belongs also to the *κόσμος*), nor would the *εἶχον* in its absolute contrast hold good, the sense of an *accepi* being then necessarily substituted. If *in the world*, Jno. i. 10, is declared to mean, As a part of the world, as a creature; and *in the form*, Phil. ii. 6, is expounded as best befitting

[1] Brought forward anew in Dr Barth's remarkable Sendscreiben an Schelling: Der Engel des Bundes. Leipzig 1845. And it is hinted at in Brandt's Schullehrerbibel, which observes upon Jno. xvii. 5, "This cannot refer to His Divinity, of which He could not be emptied, and with which He could not be glorified, but only to the glory which He had as the Angel of the Covenant before all other creatures were."

the idea of a created being—it is by an exegesis which we regard as both perilous and needless. If it is said that the *Angel of the Lord* in the Old Testament, whose identity with Christ is confessed, cannot be deemed to be an "uncreated angel" without a contradiction, we need only remember that מַלְאָךְ (used, as is well known, also of men) is generally *one sent* or a *messenger*, and that therefore there is no contradiction in His *going forth* or *being sent*, who is, nevertheless, in His nature the Word and Revealer of the hidden God. Barth himself admits that "the assumption of the Logos becoming an angel before His incarnation does not remove the difficulty, but rather increases it." Regard it as we may, it only throws it further back. We find the solution of all these difficulties—riddles and problems much harder than any which the simply-understood word of Scripture presents to us—in the acceptation of that idea of the *Living Three-One* God, which alone is conformable with Scripture. It acknowledges in the living God Himself, in consistency with His infinity, which is not a mere dead abstraction, the *principle* of all distinction and formation, that is, the *original ground*, the true ἀρχή of all κτίσις, and thus finds no difficulty in accepting the μορφὴ θεοῦ as before the creation of the world. Finally, Heb. ii. 16 may be regarded as decisive against any union of the Son with the nature of angels; not, indeed, according to the direct meaning of the *took not upon Him*, as Luther's translation assumes—but in the connection of the whole Epistle, in itself, and with the whole scriptural system, in which no trace of any such relation of *the angels* to the Son is found, even when they are professedly the subject of discourse.

Instead of all those vain and adventurous incursions into things too high for us, let us adoringly enter into the eternal counsel of *our salvation*, which was already, before the foundation of the world, purposed in the Son, whose glorification even as the Son of man was eternally contemplated by Him as predestined. This is the *practical* bearing of the inexhaustible saying which we now consider. We may quote Hermann's hymn: "The foundation of the world was not laid, heaven was not yet created, when God planned for my best interest; His grace was extended to me before I had my being. It was His counsel that I should have life through His only begotten Son; Him

would He provide as a Mediator for me, Him did He set forth as a propitiatory, that through His blood I should be sanctified and saved." Or the words of Hofacker's simple and fervent sermon on Jno. xvii.: "Satan was not yet created, nor had he fallen; Adam was not yet created, nor had he fallen; no sinner walked upon the earth, the earth itself was not yet, nor was there any sin, for there existed no creature which could sin; death was not yet, for there was none to die;—when in the eternal depths of the Godhead the *plan of redemption* was projected, the method appointed by which sin should be abolished, and death slain, by which *the Son* should bruise the serpent's head, and obtain for Himself power over all flesh, that He might give eternal life to all who should be given Him of the Father." We think, for ourselves, that it better becomes the creature, and is more in harmony with our inmost consciousness of God, is most safe to the mind, and blessed to the heart, adoringly to contemplate (Matt. xxv. 34; Eph. i. 4, 5; Jno. xvii. 24) the eternal counsel of the Creator's love in human redemption—than, with Rothe, to speculate about the continuation of the creating work in a moral process, the elevation and the transformation of the ὕλη into πνεῦμα—in theories which regard evil as necessarily and unavoidably growing out of blind matter, yet yielding by slow degrees to the necessary process of the development of God in the world; and which, finally, instead of that consummation in the σαββατισμός which the Scripture holds out, and man's heart yearns for (the pit of eternal fire, however, which glorifies the justice of God being beneath), shadows out an eternal succession of processes such as he endeavours to explain.

The prayer at its outset concerned *His own person*, as all true prayer under human relations must, when it proceeds from urgent internal impulse. But what a difference between this "*Glorify* Me!" and every "Help me! Give me!" of other children of men! In a sole and unapproachable sense the incarnate Son of God, the Saviour of all flesh, can and must first and last speak only concerning Himself in the Father's presence. The "Help Me!" can find no expression here. Instead of "Give Me!" we hear His witness, as not *before*, but already *upon* the throne, speaking in majesty on the right hand of

majesty, "Thou hast given to Me—that I may give!" and now, at the highest point of this elevation, we hear the perfect expression of that *objectivity* which, as it were, softens whatever might seem discordant in *such* a style of praying from human lips, by an inexpressible tone of lowliness mingled with dignity: —"to know Thee and *Jesus Christ* is eternal life!" Upon this follows the first *I*, which makes the Son of man who had finished the work upon earth the same in person and consciousness with Him who was with the Father before the foundation of the world. Could it be otherwise than that this prayer, so beginning, should at its conclusion *lead all back again into His own person?* The foundation was laid in the high words, Father—Thou and I—I with Thee from eternity—*We are one!* And the end of His intercession for His own can be no other than—*I in them!*

In the second and middle section of the whole (vers. 6–19) we see that this "*I in them*" is the presupposed latent foundation of all; but its *final expression* is prepared for by an exposition of the whole way and process which leads to the truth and reality of this end:—set forth in words which are most sublime, and clear, and tranquil, and comprehensible, even to the childish capacity. We find that this section falls naturally into two parts. In vers. 6–13 the *fundamental reason* is brought out, on which rests the *I pray for them*, and out of which is developed the proper *petition* for their *preservation and defence*, the concentration of all intercession. Then follows, vers. 14–19, the *process* of this prayer itself, which leads back into the principle and origin of all again—I *for* them!

From the accomplished work of the glorification of the Father upon earth, the Lord descends first to the specific *prophetic* office which was really fulfilled in this *now;* and to this is then added, the beginning of the one being the end of the other, the *Highpriestly* office, which is, as it were, introduced in ver. 19. We must maintain, against Luthardt, that the "manifestation of the name" is not entirely the same as the glorification of the Father; although they may be made, by a pregnant interpretation, equivalent one to the other. For *here* vers. 6–8 speak especially of the preparation of an intelligent, acknowledging faith in the reception of the word; and then

first ver. 17, etc., of their sanctification as it is to be consummated, and which had been already contemplated in the great *anticipation* of ver. 4. I have revealed Thy name to them, given them Thy word in the words which Thou hast given Me —and *they* have received it and kept it in acknowledging faith. This is the foundation for the fellowship between the Lord and His own, on the ground of which alone they are worthy and capable of partaking His *special* intercession (in contrast with the world). *Thus He presents them to the Father* with their present faith in Him, and that is the *first* point. Vers. 6–8.[1] Hence *He prays for them*, that is, now and here, otherwise than for the world: this, approaching still nearer to the prayer itself, is the *second*. Vers. 9, 10.[2] Finally, the *third* is the direct utterance of the prayer for their *conservation* and *defence*. Vers. 11–13. All this prepared for the recognition of their *need*, despite the beginnings of grace—They are yet *in the world!*

The *detail of the intercession* itself, prepared for by the laying of this foundation, commences as before—I have given them Thy word; and then goes on to *pray*, first for their *preservation*, because, though no longer of the world, they are yet in the world, in the πονηρόν. Vers. 14–16. And then, since the root of this *evil* is the *sin* which still adheres to them, it is manifest, secondly, that this preservation to the end is not otherwise possible than through their *sanctification*:—that it is not in their case the keeping or guarding of something already perfect in them, but a τηρεῖν ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ, a ἁγιάζειν. Vers. 17, 18.[3] Thirdly, and finally, this sanctification of His own is *carried back* to the original principle and ground of all, His redeeming and atoning work.

Ver. 6. From the reassumed glory with the Father He looks

[1] Argumentum (but not tertium, primum rather, according to our arrangement) petitum est a *qualitate personarum*, pro quibus Jesus intercedebat, in quibus *initia gratiæ* conspiciebantur, quæ *conservari* fas erat. Lampe.

[2] Not merely with Olshausen: "The positive side of the prayer is now followed by the negative."

[3] Which is a preliminary reason for not understanding *the evil* as masculine, and the *sanctifying* as a mere *consecration*.

back and looks down upon His children in this fallen world of mankind, and presents them *with Himself* to the Father. We might say, with Olshausen, "in evidence, as it were, that the work was finished"—but this only connects it with what precedes: on the other hand, what precedes had been spoken only to pave the way for what now comes, this presentation and intercession. In thus coming to the Father, the Lord brings with Him His own, who are still notwithstanding in the world and amid its evil:—it is this which is the inmost meaning and reason of His intercession. A. H. Franke finds here the first evidence of a truth, to which he afterwards frequently reverts, that not only all the Lord's then existing disciples were included with the eleven, but that all His future followers and ourselves might appropriate His words—excluding, of course, those specific references which (as in ver. 18) point to the Apostles alone. But our exposition of the three preceding chapters has already clearly established the representative character of the first disciples to whom the Lord then spoke.

As to the developing connection between ver. 6 and ver. 5, we may say generally, with Luther, "To glorify the Father means to manifest His name; thus He had so proclaimed that name, as to prove to their hearts that he was a gracious *Father*, etc." It is presently made clear, vers. 11, 12, that a living knowledge of the Father's name is intended, and in the *καὶ γνωρίσω*, ver. 26, the expression is interpreted into its full depth of meaning; it is declared that that holy name is not entirely *made known* until in the unity of perfection the whole love of God in Christ, and nothing but this love, dwells, lives, and is glorified also in the sanctified and saved. So far those expositors are right who make the common formula *the name of God* equivalent to *the nature of God itself*—throughout the Scriptures, and also here. It must not, however, be overlooked, that according to the principle and the origin of this phrase the *name* signifies the *nature* as far as it is *cognisable* and *capable of name*. From this the word here sets out:—the commencing *φανερόν* is placed in contradiction to the previous obscurity of the Old Testament; it is not yet the full *γνωρίζειν*, but is a *beginning* of it; and, as such, is shown by the sequel to have been effected through the *word* given by Him and kept

by the disciples. Christ first *preached* and testified *concerning the Father* (ch. xvi. 25)—in His own person He brought down and unfolded this great word, teaching man how he may and why he should call God his Father.[1] The question concerning the *name* of God had been hitherto answered by the inconceivable יהוה, which the awe of the far-off worshippers dared not even pronounce, and which rather repelled, therefore, than satisfied the inquiry: but now *eternal being* is plainly revealed to be *eternal love.* When by the sending of the Son, the distinction which had existed from eternity in the living love of the Divine nature itself was disclosed, and the mystery of the Trinity which had found no expression in the unity of the name *Jehovah* was brought to light—then appeared the *kindness and love* toward man of God *our Saviour*,[2] and then "a personal, absolute *principle of love* became revealed as the distinguishing idea of the Divine essence."[3] This is assuredly the proper meaning of the *Father-name* as disclosed *by the Son* also to men, in which the life-giving knowledge of the only true God both discloses itself and closes all revelation:—beyond this name and its appropriate honour the creature has nothing further to know, to confess, and to praise. Schmieder, although he sets out with a profound but general interpretation of "name," yet says at the close—"Thus understood and acknowledged the Father-name is the perfect name of God simply." In all other apprehension of God, as Tholuck says, letters and syllables only of His name are heard. We more truly understand τὸ ὄνομα thus, most certainly, than if we should dismiss it, with B.-Crusius, by "the confession of Thee"—for the question here is *what* and *who* God is to be known and confessed to be. The Father-name brought to us by Christ "is the true name by which man may know God, that is, see and feel His heart, His will, and His work." (Luther.) But in what way did Christ first and alone reveal this name? Assuredly, by His word or

[1] Hence Nonnus is not essentially wrong—οὔνομα σὸν κήρυξα.

[2] The Jehovah-name is glorified in the Jesus-name, as the New Testament ὁ κύριος would indicate.

[3] As Kling says—or Braune, somewhat differently: "As the immeasurable principle of love, as the holy and good Father, who inclines to the creatures dependent on Him, with unfathomable *compassion.*

words, as Himself says; but this does not mean through His *doctrine* or *teaching* as such—as if nothing more was necessary than to tell men, and help their reason to apprehend, as the blind Rationalists say, that God is a loving and compassionate Father. It is the most lying desecration of this all-holy name, to detach the Son's teaching concerning the good Father above from all those other doctrines which He taught as the foundation or qualification of that truth. For He did not first and at once declare the Father to be the general Father of compassion without any mediation; but He announced Him *first* to be His own, the Son's Father, and then ours, because He hath given to us the Son. The word concerning the Father was at the same time a word concerning the Son; a self-testimony to the personality of this Jesus Christ. Thus, not properly speaking by His doctrine, but *in His person*, from the time of His incarnation, to which the works and words bare witness, as the sent One *in whom is the name of God* (Ex. xxiii. 21) as the covenant-Angel come,—did He reveal the name of the Father as eternal Love. Finally, and it must be carefully noted, in this *I have manifested* there lies the same great *prolepsis* which pervades the whole prayer; for the prophetic office was glorified in the fruit of a clear and living knowledge by the *Spirit*, commencing in preludes from the day of the resurrection itself. The risen Lord, now first Himself justified and glorified as the Son, announces in His first words to His *brethren*, Jno. xx. 17, the name of *His* Father and *their* Father for the first time in all its distinctness—as it was predicted in Ps. xxii. 23, comp. Heb. ii. 11, 12. And all this is here anticipated and included. The *Ἐγώ* must have its emphasis, though not expressed, in the *ἐφανέρωσα* (as it stood prominently before the *ἐδόξασα* and *ἐτελείωσα*), (Matt. xi. 27); for it must not be forgotten that the word, work, and life of the Son of God *upon earth*, before He returns to heaven, fulfils as one great collective self-testimony of that *Person* who is *the Son*, the so-called prophetic office of the Redeemer.

Unto the men—thus after ver. 5 the glorified Son of God speaks as if from above; appropriates Himself and in Himself the Father *specifically* to these children of men, whose brother He has become and will be for ever. Lampe rightly says, cum

exclusione angelorum; for this is now the permanent pre-eminence of the Adamic creature over all other "children of God," even the "morning stars" (Job xxxviii. 7), that they through Christ have God as in the most direct and essential manner their Father. In the κόσμος of ver. 5 all creatures were included and surveyed; but the Lord's contemplation now descends to the *world of mankind* to whom he belongs—and in this restricted sense he says, ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου. Even the *Apostles*, who were first referred to, are no other than *men* given to Him out of the world (which knoweth not the Father, ver. 25, and to which they also by nature belonged). But this universal expression presently teaches us, that the Intercessor, standing as it were on high, already regarded in them the representatives of *all* men generally who should ever be given to Him.[1] Whom Thou hast given[2] Me out of the world—thus does ver. 2 look back to and connect itself with ch. xv. 19. "With what complacency and how often does Jesus mention in this prayer that the Father had given Him *all!* In the Father's presence He keeps perfect silence as to His own electing energy (ch. xv. 16), by which He had made the disciples His own." (Schmieder.) But what is involved in this *giving* is plainly unfolded in the following clause, which forms the *point of transition* between the disciples' having *before* been *of the world* and their *now being* Christ's.

Thine they were—it is idle to understand this as if it meant, As Thy creatures, like the whole world; or even, with Richter, "like all men, in the love of Thy compassion." For ἐκ τοῦ κοσμοῦ means not the world, in as far as it is God's; nor does the Father unconditionally give any man to His Son from the evil world. Hezel's note is very unworthy: "that which I would give must be Mine—all these men were Thine, created by Thee—Thou couldst thus give them unto Me!" and the predestinarian turn which another writer gives it, is nothing less

[1] "He uses so general an expression concerning them, because He beheld in them the first fruits of those who should in future be given to Him." (Rieger.)

[2] Lachmann's ἔδωκας everywhere in vers. 6–8, instead of δέδωκας (only in ver. 8, δέδωκα αὐτοῖς), may safely be preferred; as these better unfold the aorist-historical procedure toward the final result.

than blasphemous, "Thou couldst put them to any use Thou wouldst!"[1] And yet we read in more than one exposition, "They were Thine by eternal election." We think that, as chap. vi. 37, 44, 45, defined the giving of the Father to be a preparatory drawing to the Son, *Thine they were* can here mean no other than this preparation and drawing over from the world to the Son—which may be regarded as the economy of the Father before the kingdom of the Son is set up. Is, then, this *Thine they were* in its widest sense equivalent to the being *of God*, chap. viii. 47, or *of the truth*, as even a heathen, according to chap. xviii. 37, might be? We regard the fundamental principle as the same, but this cannot suffice for the meaning in its reference to the *Apostles* (and those then included with them); for the necessary complement in their case seems to be —They were Thine as *under the Old Testament!* This work of the Father preparing for and leading to Christ must find its recognition somewhere in this prayer; for it was already intimated in ver. 3. Indeed, all who were the children of Abraham according to the flesh, and united in the fellowship of the covenant of law and promise, were so far *God's*, and were to be given to Him again in Christ. (Matt. xxii. 21.) But the greater part were unwilling and unfit for this, because the truth of their covenant relation had been annulled in them, and Israel itself had become a κόσμος. Consequently, the Old Testament preparation is here regarded only as far as it was a *reality;* the disciples of Jesus had previously been genuine, sincere Israelites, the *escaped or reserved* in Israel, Isa. iv. 2—the holy seed, ch. vi. 13. So that we agree with Rieger in the issue, "they were the Father's, not only as His creatures and the heirs of the covenant with the fathers, but also as good hearts yielding to the discipline and drawing of God."

[1] The view of the Berlenb. Bibel is incorrect from another point, and is, moreover, altogether alien to the context: "They were Thine, in Thine eternal Fatherly counsel, from the creation," it explains, and then farther illustrates, thus: "First, Thou hadst right in and claim upon them as Creator, and they upon Thee—which a penitent may plead against original sin. Secondly: They lay shut up under Thy Fatherly severity—they have been delivered to Me by the hand of justice, that I might set them at one with Thee again." All this is either vague, or incorrect, or inappropriate to the connexion.

This holds good in the fullest sense of the *Apostles*, whom the Lord has here *primarily* in view, and then of the greater part of His first disciples. He did not, as some seem to think, translate even the Apostles by a sudden conversion out of the midst of the publicans and sinners. And in the case of others, where there might appear to be a sudden, instantaneous, and immediate election out of the world, there had been in reality an analogous work of transition, or preparatory drawing of the Father:—it was not wanting even in the instance of Saul, despite all appearances. And we may extend this further, and seek the deeper principle which underlies even the Old-Testament preparation, as the Father's giving to Christ. Thus Meyer, "Conversion to Jesus Christ is wont to be preceded by an awakened sense for God and right, *an old covenant*, whence follows the actual drawing of the Father to the Son." Better to say that this awakening is itself the drawing. For, as Braune says, "General piety, whether Jewish or Gentile, is a thread which leads into the kingdom of Christ. *He who feareth God is accepted of Him.* Scorn not, therefore, any piety or fear of God, though it be not yet Christian."

With the *propter electionem*, by which, of course, Lampe explains *Thine they were*, we need not trouble ourselves much; since even the concluding clause of the verse, and more particularly ver. 8, refers the decision to the men themselves, to their receiving His word, their knowing, and believing. It might appear, indeed, as if *and they have kept Thy word* indicated the gradual progress of the disciples' faith in Christ, and even their perseverance in faith. This must be included, since He is here presenting them to the Father as having continued till now His own, the fruit of His mission; but we think, furthermore, that this concluding clause looks back upon, and is the summary of the whole past; bringing forward the human decision of these men, as the *other side* not only of *Thou gavest them to Me*, but also of the first *Thine they were*. It might indeed be thought that τὸν λόγον σου is parallel with τὸ ὄνομά σου, and expounded again by the ῥήματα of ver. 8. But, remembering that Jesus uses, throughout these final discourses, the formula τὸν λόγον μου τηρεῖν (ch. xiv. 23, etc.), we are inclined to regard this emphatic and peculiar λόγον σου as includ-

ing the Old-Testament, preparatory word of God, and τηρεῖν as being, in a general sense, the acceptation, and observance, and holding fast of that word.[1] It is then the correlative of ch. v. 38; and at the same time an explanation of the *giving* of the Father as being their *learning* of Him—similarly to ch. vi. 44, 45. This view seems best to accord with the general sense of the words which describe these men, taken out of the world, as having been believers and worthy from the beginning until now. So Luther accepts it: "They were Thine, He says; and it is as if He should say, Whosoever heareth the word, openeth his ears and his heart, and lets God's revelation penetrate his soul, belongs no longer to the world, but (in due course) to Me!" And he further goes on to show how far we may assure ourselves of being God's, by the manner and sincerity of our own hearing and keeping of His word.

Vers. 7, 8. This *now* makes prominent the New Testament position which the disciples had reached; and here is the connection which Lücke finds wanting. He also regards the development of the thought as too loose, and cannot see for what purpose "this evolution of the nature and origin of the disciples' faith" is introduced; finding, further, in all this, evidence of the Evangelist's composition. He is good enough, however, to allow that this process of thought might not be altogether alien to the praying spirit, and that "the composition may be justified on that ground!" We earnestly beg this excellent expositor to weigh these words well in a second edition, and if possible remove them; for they cannot but be offensive to many readers of his commentary who think the composition of St John above any human judgment, and further believe that the Spirit of inspiration has actually reproduced the very prayer of the Son of God in this chapter. For ourselves, we find here in every word a most worthy meaning, thoughts the unfolding of which is perfectly harmonious. Ver. 7 in connection with ver. 6 rises again from the specific to the general view of Christ's work, returns to the revelation of the Father-

[1] *Including* the O. T. word, not that alone. Alford supposes me to mean the latter, and objects that its place would have been, in that case, *before* the δέδωκας. My meaning is that the Lord speaks comprehensively and in a transitional way of both—as it were proleptically for vers. 7, 8.

name, and explains it—Now know they *Thee in Me*, the Father in the Son. In πάντα ὅσα the entire testimony of His works to His person is summed up in one; but then, in the sense which we have often expounded, the ῥήματα, as the basis and test of the knowledge of faith, are brought forward into prominence. According to ch. vii. 17, xii. 44–50 this is the beginning of faith in Christ,—to acknowledge His word as given Him of God, to accept and admit this testimony, to let it abide and give it room in the heart, and thus to keep it. That the *knowing* here precedes the *believing* is strictly consistent with ver. 3; and shows decisively that the Lord in this intercession for His disciples admits no other faith than that which is based on knowledge.[1] All the words given to Him of the Father, He had given to them—just as in chap. xv. 15 and elsewhere. We think that in this most solemn final testimony the Lord makes direct allusion to that important passage, Deut. xviii. 18, 19. He thereby refers, by tacit opposition, to the opposing and doomed unbelief of all those who would *not* hear and receive the words which the Father had put in His mouth, and which He had spoken in His name. But He also thereby declares the work which He had already accomplished to be that fulfilment and consummation of the *prophetic* office which Moses there predicted. All the *individual* words which He had spoken He sums up and seals, in His Father's presence, in these ῥήματα given by Him to be received by man.

When He now bears joyful witness before the Father to the understanding faith of His beloved disciples, He quotes, as it were, and confirms their own literal confession in chap. xvi. 30—yea, He dignifies their albeit weak πιστεύομεν into an ἔγνωσαν. We doubt whether Fikenscher's distinction of the two parallel clauses is tenable: he says, "rightly is the relation to *Christ* called a *knowing*, to the *Father* a *believing*." For, παρὰ σοῦ ἐξῆλθον and σύ με ἀπέστειλας reciprocally explain each other as perfect correlatives; the latter, however, less profound in its expression, being added in order graciously

[1] Ἔγνωκα is found in many MSS.—a strange error of the old copyists, followed even by the Syr. There can be no imaginable place found for νῦν ἔγνωκα, as referred to our Lord, least of all in this prayer.

to include all commencing faith, that namely which might apprehend His being sent but not yet His proceeding from the Father—before He goes on to say, For these and all like them *I pray!* Both, however, are united in one—They believe *on Me*—as it is said afterward in ver. 20. For His name alone, as the name of the Son, avails to all men under heaven for the knowledge of the name of the Father. The ἀληθῶς which is significantly added to *they have known*, and which is to be referred also to *they have believed*, has a tone of gracious encouragement as proceeding from the lips of the Searcher of hearts; but it seems also, as preceding "I pray *for them*" to contain a warning rejection of all self-imagined or hypocritical believing and knowing. It may also be compared with the בֶּאֱמֶת of Ps. cxlv. 18. Well for us, if we do not merely utter our own *we have believed* and *we have known*, but are also *acknowledged* before the Father by the ἀληθῶς of His Son!

Ver. 9. That which He had promised in Matt. x. 32, He begins now to fulfil; as well as what He had said in John xiv. 16—I will *ask* the Father for you; we therefore plainly perceive that that denial of any intercession, which had intervened in ch. xvi. 26, 27, has a sense by no means inconsistent with this. As the High Priest, who has no sign of His own, yea, whose own infirmity itself became the power of God in Him for the world's redemption, He has hitherto only *presented* His own person and work in the Father's presence, and the disciples only as they are the fruit of that work which He brings with Him. The twice-spoken *glorify Me* was less a petition than a claim, resting upon ἐλήλυθεν ἡ ὥρα and καὶ νῦν,—a confident expectation, consistent with the testimony which He had uttered concerning the whole relation between the Father and Himself. But now, as the Representative of weak and sinful men, He uses for the first time an express ἐρωτῶ[1]—this, however, being dignified by the Ἐγώ which emphatically precedes. All that we have heard, in the discourses which prepare for this prayer, concerning the distinction, now made perfect, between believers and the world, must be applied to our understanding of the

[1] The critical distinction between which and αἰτῶ has been referred to on chap. xiv. 16 and xvi. 26.

sense in which Jesus here rigidly distinguishes His praying for His own from His praying for the world. For that He does not deny and renounce all prayer for the world, is as certain as that He now offers that intercession for His own which nevertheless He had before relatively denied. The prayer for His enemies upon the cross, the testimony of the Holy Spirit in subsequent apostolical teaching (Heb. vii. 25), yea, the very close itself of *this* prayer, vers. 20, 21, 23, all declare His intercession for the world. Not indeed for *the* world which continues because it will continue in its ungodly character, which therefore receiveth not the Spirit of truth, and *can* never "come unto God through Him" (hence this limitation in Heb. vii. 25)—but still for all who should believe, and even for the weighty testimony of believers *in order that* the world may believe and know. Thus an unconditional exclusion of the world from Christ's intercession is contrary to the mind of Christ and the entire Scripture: as certainly and as universally as He died for all, He mediates for all; for His intercession is the fruit, consequence, and power of His redeeming work. Calvin and those who follow him find in this *I pray not for the world* their *decretum reprobationis* pronounced upon the *vasa iræ;* but what we have already said renders any further refutation of this unnecessary. Lampe's frightful conclusion is perfectly *perverse:* "When Jesus thus excludes them from His intercession, He declares that He is not their High Priest, and therefore that He was *not about to die for them.* For these are the two inseparable offices of the High Priest, and they have an equal extent of operation. And the rather is this true, as it would have been a much less thing to pray for sinners than to die for them. Hence we may argue here from the less to the greater." This is to place one single misunderstood word in opposition to the simplest, clearest, most abundant testimonies of Scripture. Luther at first seemed, alas, to assent to this (in his exposition of Jno. xvii.): "From this nothing can follow but that they must be altogether lost, as those of whom *Christ will know nothing.*" But in another place he corrects himself: "To pray for the world, and not to pray for the world, must both be right in their place. For He afterwards says Himself, ver. 20—*for them also which shall believe.* But these must be

as yet of the world, and therefore He must pray for the world, on account of those who should be brought out of it." (See the whole passage in Tholuck.) Since the believing and the coming to Him rests finally in our own decision—that, however, being possible only through the power which has been obtained by Him and extended to us[1]—it cannot be but that the intercession of Him who "willeth not that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance" (2 Pet. iii. 9), should actually apply to the *whole* world, *in order that* all may be able to believe, if they will. During the great term of long forbearance before the final decision, He maketh intercession for the transgressors (Isa. liii. 12), restraining judgment, demanding faith and offering its blessings to man. If we say to the believer, He prayeth for thee, that thy faith fail not—so may we say to the unbeliever, He prayeth for thee, that thou mayest believe! The conflict between the Divine will and the freedom of man, which is solved by the prescience of the issue, but without any reprobating predestination, enters deeply into the High-priestly prayer, as we shall see upon ver. 12.

A well-meaning distinction is generally introduced here—I pray not *now*, in this place, for the world; but this is certainly insufficient, and the correction is better which reads, I pray not *in this manner* for the world. For in its connection with vers. 6–8, the word means, first—I pray not indeed for such as are unworthy, but for such as have become Thine, who have already believed; but as such He could not present the world to the Father, that He might regard them with complacency, defend and love them like His own. It has been said, This is the Testament, and none but the heirs are spoken of; but we would add more specifically, None but those who have already entered into the inheritance. "The prayer of Christ for the world takes quite a different form from that for the Church. The *former* is to the effect that the world may cease to be what it is; the *latter*, that the Church may be perfected in that which it

[1] B.-Crusius does not understand this: "The theological question as to how this power could be *prayed for*, whereas man himself is appealed to as having it in his own decision, concerns not the Spirit of the New Testament, etc." O no, all is actually prayed for and obtained by prayer; but not for the irresistible constraint of a free creature.

has received into itself." (Olshausen.) The prophetic word, Ps. xvi. 3, 4, where certainly priestly intercession may be admitted,[1] has the same sense as here, the exclusion of the world from the specific complacency of approving intercession. As the typical high priest prayed only for Israel, bore only the twelve tribes on his breastplate, so there is a corresponding prayer of the eternal High Priest only for the true people of God—which, however, by no means excludes the calling of the Gentiles to enter into the true Israel. It is altogether in harmony with the Apostle's word, 1 Tim. iv. 10, which has its force for the prayers of the Church also—He is the Saviour of all men, *specially* of them that believe. "Every one enters into the precious privilege of this *special* intercession, so soon as he opens his heart for the acceptance and observance of the words of Christ as widely as the disciples did in their years of pupilage." (Rieger.) All others, as long as their unbelief and hatred of God is not yet perfect, and they do not altogether *know what they do*, their repentance unto remission being possible, partake in the "Father, forgive them!" of the cross, and the continuous energy of Gospel testimony which is the fruit of His intercession—that the world may believe.

Concerning those who already believe, those already given to Him, the Lord says once more to the Father—*For they are Thine!* That does not mean merely, They *were*, they became Thine, therefore Thou couldst give them to Me; but it refers to their present condition, They *are* and continue Thine even as given to Me; by Me they are to be fully given back to Thyself. This is established by what follows.

Ver. 10. This leads us back to ch. xvi. 15. But what a word of majesty and Divine power to be found in *prayer* before God! "It would not have been so much if He had said simply, All that which is Mine, is Thine. For every one may say that all he has is God's. But He inverts the words, and says, All that which is Thine, is Mine. No creature could thus speak before God." (Luther.) Yes, truly, this πάντα—not πάντες—includes the eternal Divinity, and changes the prayer into a free, rightful, and unrestricted taking from the fulness, power, and

[1] Which we now fully admit, though it was denied in the Com. on Psalms.

love of the Father—in whose presence He can say, We are One! But the conclusion, *And I am glorified in them*, goes yet further, And all that which is Thine and Mine belongs *also to them*. So that every Christian may, in the joyful confidence of faith, utter the same word to Christ, All that is Thine is mine! (1 Cor. iii. 21–23.) It is obvious, again, that the Son presents His disciples to the Father as those in whom He Himself already lived. Grotius: itaque in ipsorum personâ mea res vertitur. De Wette and Stolz very incorrectly translate, I am glorified *by* them! This *by them* (which cannot be found in the ἐν) was yet entirely in the future; but the glorification of the Lord *in them* had already its living commencement, so that He could presuppose and build upon their future in anticipation. Certainly, there was much wanting to the full truth and reality of this δεδόξασμαι, as Schmieder says, "He knew that the revelation of Himself in their minds was still exposed to many obscurations, and that He was not yet fully glorified in them"—but the Lord confidently looks forward to its consummation.[1] For He had declared in vers. 6–8 the foundation to have been fully laid; but this is a wonderful prolepsis, as of the justifying and sanctifying good pleasure of God toward us in Christ, so also of our own apprehending faith,—the consummation being regarded in the beginning. We need not, therefore, qualify the words, as Bengel himself does, Tales se præbuerunt, in quibus glorificarer. The Lord contemplates the end and issue, in its first principle, by anticipation.

Ver. 11. But now comes the development of the specific object of His intercession, *what* He prays for on behalf of these *men* who are His:—their being kept, that is, to the sure consummation of that *glorification of Christ in them* which had now begun. They are as yet men *in the world*, although given to Him out of the world, and "*the Saviour well knew what it was to be in the world!*" (Hofacker.) This last feeling is in the sympathising heart of the High Priest, when He says first, anticipating already the victory—I am no more in the world. He

[1] "Which is the more wonderful, the Lord's consciousness of His fellowship with the Father, or His glance into the future of these weak disciples?" (Braune.) Who but He could have seen in these Eleven the teachers of the world, the overturners of Heathenism, the foundations of the Church?

no more, but they still in the world—both to be understood not so much concerning the place as the *condition.* The thoughts which proceed so peacefully in their mutual qualifications, flow also from the mighty impulses of equally deep feeling. And therefore the Lord, standing upon the threshold and conscious of the way which He has yet to walk, limits by *I come*[1] the *I am no more in the world.* Although in some degree still remaining in them, He yet *leaves* His beloved disciples on going to the Father! And this thought touches His heart with the feeling of all *their* future *need.* His personal presence with them in the flesh was "a protecting might"—see ch. xvi. 4. But now was needed the power and protection of the Father, through the Spirit to be obtained by Jesus for men. His intercession is, therefore, properly, the promised prayer for the sending of the Holy Ghost.

As He thus comes to the Father (πρός σε) and presents Himself before Him, He uses in His invocation that all-holy name (by the Pope so miserably desecrated!) which here *alone* is found in the lips of Jesus—*Holy Father!* This is assuredly something different from and more than the subsequent *Righteous Father!* ver. 25. Both appellatives are added for the sake of the disciples whom He prays for; for He never used any such in addressing His Father on His own behalf. The *holiness* of God, a word which pervades the whole Scripture,[2] is but little understood and often very inadequately explained. There is in it, indeed, something transcendent, which cannot be reproduced in any other words;[3] and even the classical expressions which correspond to it have in the obscurity of their etymology, and the amplitude of their application, *something* of the same character as the dark and mysterious scriptural

[1] For in ver. 13 we perceive that Jesus well knows Himself to be still in the world. His words go now backward, now forward. (Schmieder.)

[2] Yet (as Achelis observes) this previously frequent attribute of God is rare in the N. T. He is right, but says incorrectly that the only passages are Jno. xvii. 11; 1 Pet. i. 16 (ver. 15 too); and Rev. iv. 8. He forgets Lu. i. 49; 1 Jno. ii. 20; in the Revelation ch. vi. 10 (iii. 7), xv. 4, xvi. 5, and also Heb. xii. 10.

[3] As Harms in his well-known 36th Thesis boldly challenged: Let him who can master by his reason the first letter of all religion, that is, the word "holy," come forward and declare it to me!

קָדוֹשׁ. But the Bible, when the whole of it is appealed to, gives us light enough for the rejection of every false and insufficient meaning. It is plain that *not merely* purity or separation from all evil (justitia interna, *ἀναμαρτησία* Dei) is the idea of God's holiness; for then would it be one with His righteousness. Nor is it *merely* the incomparable, unapproachable *onliness* of God which is meant (as it were the *tremenda* majestas); for it is the joy of His worshippers to call Him Holy, and, still more, we also are to be made holy as He is holy! Men exhaust themselves in all kinds of indistinct imaginings about this dread mystery; and when they speak of "*the majesty of grace*," come nearer perhaps to a right feeling of its import. Lücke interprets it in this place as "the power of God which preserves the good in the world from being defiled and dissipated:" this appears to be deduced from the context, but needs to be explained, and even to be modified, since the Holy One condescends in His sanctifying power even to sinners. B.-Crusius: "*ἅγιος* is He who is exalted above the world, *saving out of it*." This also is a right feeling after the truth; but the great point is that which mediates between these two clauses—it is the condescending love itself which shows Him to be thus exalted.

We have on many passages already avowed that the primary truth in Menken's otherwise one-sided view must be regarded as strictly scriptural—God is holy in His condescending, compassionate, saving *love*. The two great words, God is holy—God is love, are assuredly correlative. We cannot at the outset do other than repeat what we said upon the Epistle to the Hebrews (Th. ii. S. 306), "God is holy, that is, *exalted* in His ineffable and incomparable *praiseworthiness above all praise of* the creature, while He in pure love condescends to the creature, even to His fallen creatures, in order to re-establish in them *this* His honour and glory, that He is love." That He as absolute *purity* cannot be hurt or touched by the evil of sin, but remains sublime above the *world*, is certainly *the first idea from which the word proceeds*, but is far from being the only thing which Revelation discloses to us in this expression; for the Lord presently declares Himself to be holy in this and through this, that *His love is sanctified again even in the unholy*, and He by this condescension to us is raised still higher for our adoration. Conse-

quently, it is not so much in itself, in the circle of angelic intelligences, and in the heavenly light of the pure creation, as *in and among men* that His holiness is displayed :—where He draws nigh to sinners, to bless and unite them to Himself, there is the קֹדֶשׁ, in the temple as before in the holy ground, Ex. iii. 5. *Therefore* the Seraphim call Him Holy in *that* sanctuary from which His glory should go forth over *all the earth.* Isa. vi. The devils and the damned reach not to the acknowledgment and sense of His holiness; in hell they feel no more than that He is almighty, omniscient, *just!* Where the praise of His *love* dwells, there alone is heard *Holy!* That in קָדוֹשׁ the idea of such condescension is distinctive and essential, is taught by Isaiah's קְדוֹשׁ יִשְׂרָאֵל, which would otherwise have no meaning;—for the normal passage, among many, we may refer to Isa. xli. 14. See, moreover, Ps. xxii. 4–7, lxxxix. 16–19, ciii. 1, but especially the entire Ps. xcix. vers. 1–5 of which fore-announce a proper exposition of the holiness of God, which is given vers. 6–9. All these, and many similar passages, are not to be summarily explained by that old first notion, which, strangely enough, that enlightened inquirer, Meyer, retains—"Separate from all that is evil and impure, and unapproachable by it; *hence* supremely to be honoured, and above all possibility of being injured, inviolable in sanctity." Nor are they to be satisfied by "the most perfect accordance between His will and His knowledge"—or the like.[1] Are passages desired which almost explicitly make *holy* equivalent to merciful, redeeming, forgiving? Weigh well the simple connection in Mary's song of praise, Lu. i. 49, 50, compared with Isa. lvii. 15, 16; Ps. cii. 20, 21. We would unceasingly urge these latter passages upon all who cannot reconcile themselves to the incontrovertible scriptural interpretation of this word. But most decisive appears to us, finally, Hos. xi. 8, 9, when rightly read, where we hear in express terms,—I will not execute the fierceness of Mine anger, I will not return to destroy Ephraim: *for* I am God and not man; the *Holy One* in the midst of thee, and I will not come with wrath![2]

[1] For instance, Kahnis says almost oracularly: "In the knowledge of Himself wise, in His own will holy, in His own love blessed."

[2] Here is "love the ground-tone of the word." The *holiness* of God is not opposed to a wrath "which not so restrained would cease to be Divine"

Thus much then is certain, that in all these passages of Scripture the fundamental idea of the word is that of merciful, condescending, wrath-restraining Love. We cannot altogether, however, agree with Menken that *holy* and *merciful* are synonymous; nor would we say with him that the word expresses only the self-abasing love or lowliness of God! Most assuredly God is holy *also* in His anger, in His judgments, in the unchangeable truth of His nature, which permits Him not to forgive the sinners to whom He is merciful without chastisement of their sin, the taking away of their evil, and revelation of His own righteousness:—and of this Ps. xcix. 8 might be taken as a normal passage which gives its solution. *Holy* love, with all its compassion of condescension, retains its enmity and opposition to the evil as such; though this concomitant consequence is by no means the *fundamental idea*, as Schöberlein says, "the essential self-preserving attitude of God's personality as opposed to the sinner."[1] For God is in Scripture termed holy, not in His opposition to the sinner, but as stooping to him—"drawing nigh to Israel," as Achelis says. How otherwise could we ever become holy? How could the application of the word pass, as it does in the New Testament, from God to us, if its fundamental idea was the self-defence of God against sin? Nitzsch comes nearest to the truth, on *this* side of the question, when he says, "not saving and condescending love in itself is the idea of the Divine holiness, but the correcting *truth of love* which in this condescension and self-communication punishes the evil." But we would substitute —Not so much the former as the latter, not the former alone, God is not merely holy in the unity of His love with His truth and righteousness; but, inasmuch as love in Him (to speak humanly) restrains the wrath of His punitive justice, and, as in Hosea, overcomes it, He may be said not to leave man to His judgment until all the methods of mercy are exhausted. Hence

(as Münchmeyer says), but to the fierceness of a righteous wrath already kindled.

[1] Comp. in Schmieder, S. 125, and S. u. K. 1847. i., the whole tractate of Achelis, who finally admits that "Menken paved the way for a true understanding of the word." Sartorius falls back again upon the favourite "self-preserving purity," and adds (S. u. K. 1847. iv. S. 1002), "Redemption is not based upon the holiness of love, but upon compassion!" but this can hardly be reconciled with Lu. i. 49, 50.

the acknowledgment of His *holiness* is the last and greatest tribute in the glorification of His works,—after "Righteous in all His ways" comes "Holy in all His works" (where, indeed, we have חָסִיד, most fitly instead of קָדוֹשׁ—making this meaning most clear). Thus God, finally, as the Merciful One, who is at the same time just and true in this communication of His saving love, abides for ever the only God, worthy of all praise, to be adored with the deepest reverence (hence sometimes the נוֹרָא is connected with the קָדוֹשׁ)—but this holiness in its fullest and profoundest sense has its New-Testament disclosure in the equally sublime and condescending *Father-name*. And thus the formula which Christ here uses—*Holy Father*—condenses the Old and New Testament expressions into one, uniting the deepest word of the past revelation with the new name which was now to be revealed, and both being one in their meaning. Let us weigh attentively Heb. xii. 5–10, where the paternal *holiness of the Father* of spirits, of which we are to be partakers, is presented to us as the union of paternal love with the judicial (and properly speaking equally *paternal*) severity against sin. We would say, with Liebner; "*Love* is the *positive* essence of holiness which only takes for granted the negative; in saying *summa in Deo puritas—what* is denied and excluded? Essentially all evil, that is, all *selfishness*, and therefore all *negation of love*" (Christologie i. 108). Once more, *not* "the self-preservation of God, notwithstanding His condescension" (Schmieder), but rather His *condescension* in conjunction with His self-preservation, and even in order to it—for the securing of His highest honour.

It is, consequently, as humbly praying in the name of the sinners whose Representative He is, and at the same time as confidently speaking in His own name, that Jesus appeals to the holy Paternity, and paternal Holiness of God, for the preservation and defence, and (what is inseparable from it) for the progressive purification and sanctification of His dependents. Keep them *in Thy name*—on which Francke says simply, "which name He had even now named," and this precisely expresses the sense. It is certainly wrong to interpret here, *through* Thy name,[1]

[1] In the English Bible we find in ver. 11 *through Thine own name:* and Wesley both in ver. 11 and ver. 12, *through Thy name.*

that is, by Thy power—through Thine aid, Chrys., Theophyl., Euthym. And equally incorrect that which Klee prefers—for Thine own sake. For we must hold fast the connection with ver. 6; and ver. 12 plainly expresses the meaning. The abiding in the knowledge of the revealed name, the abiding with and in God, is meant, and nothing else. Luther: "This is to be kept in the name of God, to keep His word pure and living in our hearts. For this is God's name, or honour, or praise, that He should be thus known and acknowledged, etc." Looking still more intently upon it, we may say that Christ, who bears in Himself and brings to the world the name of the Father, prays as if He should say, Keep them *in Me!*

With this *seems* very well to agree the reading ᾧ δέδωκάς μοι which is generally preferred to οὓς—. It must be admitted that οὓς has for it the weakest authorities (only Cod. D., and there as an emendation, with some of the versions, where it might have passed over from ver. 6), while ᾧ was received generally by the ancients.[1] But internal criticism will not allow *us* to regard the ᾧ with many "as a reading which commends itself." For what could it mean *here*, that the Father had *given His name* to Christ? Alford replies by saying, "The *name* of God is that which was to be *in the Angel of the Covenant*, Exod. xxiii. 21, see also Isa. ix. 6; Jer. xxiii. 6." But this Old Testament and obscure expression could not be found interposed in the full unfolded simplicity of *this* prayer, with any meaning χριστοπρεπῶς. We would further ask, What could it mean *here?* here where the *Father-name* is introduced? Such superficiality as that of de Wette, "which, that is, the revelation of which Thou hast intrusted to Me," and all kindred interpretations, condemn themselves as opposed to that deep meaning of *name* which we cannot but recognise here. Such an one is that of Hess—"of which Thou hast thought Me worthy (to be called Thy Son)!" The *Father* did indeed give His word and His words to the *Son*, for His work upon earth, in the flesh; but that He had given His *name* also to Him (first *revealed* to the Son, as then by the Son to us?) is opposed alike to the essential unity *and* the essential distinction between the Son and the Father. Nor are we

[1] Semler's conjecture ὡς deserves no remark.

helped by Schmieder's—Keep them in Thy name, *through which* Thou hast given them to Me! The disciples being represented in the same clause as *in* the name *through* which they were given to Me![1] This reading, therefore, will admit of no kind of consistent exposition. Nevertheless, we would not retain the very slenderly supported reading *οὕς*; but agree with Bengel, who gives the reading ὃ the preference.[2] Not referring, however, this ὃ to *ὄνομα*, but in the same sense of *comprehensiveness* in the neuter as the *πᾶν ὃ δέδωκας* connected with the *αὐτοῖς*, in ver. 2. This is strongly supported also, as Bengel observes, by the *ἓν* which immediately follows; and in ver. 24 we have the same reading recurring, *ὃ δέδωκάς με*, which plainly shows that it was not referred to the *ὄνομα* by those who introduced it. Thus the *ἕν* is an allusion to the *πᾶν* of the earlier verse:—Keep them in Thy name, (all) *that which* Thou hast given Me, that this All may be *One*. This very unusual, but profound, collocation of ὃ with *αὐτοὺς*, has misled the copyists, though ver. 2 might have assisted them to understand it. Hence the various readings.[3]

That they *may be One!* Here at the commencement of the interceding *τήρησον*—before the specific development of their *defence* against evil, and sanctification in the truth, which follows vers. 12–19—the prayer glances forward for a moment to the great *end* of their preservation, as it is made prominent afterward in a new paragraph, vers. 21–23. It is obviously to be understood, One among themselves, because one with Me and Thee, with Us. But now the unity of believers is by an absolute *as* placed in comparison with the unity of the Father and the Son—this application being as bold as the exalted *ἡμεῖς*, and unless *this* equality be justified, *too* bold! How is this *as* to be rightly understood? But the Father and the Son are in the *ὁμοουσία* one in an essentially different sense from that in which

[1] Better than this would be Lange's *In which* Thou hast given them to Me! if only the ᾧ could be taken literally for ἐν ᾧ!

[2] We do not regard this, with Lücke, to have originated from the ᾧ; but, conversely, the *attraction* was a grammatical correction which misunderstood the meaning.

[3] We cannot see how the plural ᾧσιν opposes (as Luthardt thinks) the application to the disciples; but refer again, and more expressly, to ver. 2.

we can be one with each other or one with God in Christ. Certainly, in ch. x. 30, where the ἕν ἐσμεν laid the strong emphasis upon the unity of power, and thus absolutely of the Divine nature, such a juxtaposition could have no place; but here in the *as we are one* the ὁμόνοια alone is prominent, and in that sense our unity will admit of comparison, just as our serving, loving, and dying for the brethren, may be compared with the self-sacrifice of Christ. (See, *e.g.*, that impressive passage, Eph. v. 25–28.) This is the first explanation, but it by no means exhausts the meaning of our Lord's prayer that they may *be one;* for He not only compares this union by the *as* with the union of the Father and the Son, but unites it inseparably with the latter, and makes that its foundation. (Ver. 21. *And they in us.*—Ver. 22. *I in them.) By this the one is not reduced,*[1] *but the other is exalted:*—this is the often used expression which just maintains the truth. Athanasius himself, in his zeal to take this passage out of the hands of the heretics, reduced its meaning too much—Quemadmodum Pater et filius sunt unum essentiâ, ita nos *aliqua similitudine et rudi formula*, dum in eum respicimus, efficimur unum, una inter nos et mutua concordia animi et Spiritus unitate. But this very Spiritus unitas points to a profounder meaning. If we are in Christ and Christ in us by the Spirit, this extends to a depth of reality in our union with God, such as St Peter points to in his second Epistle (ch. i. 4) —"partakers of the divine *nature*,"—in connection with which, however, the "that ye may *be made*" retains the true distinction as it concerns us. Bengel remarks, "Jesus does not ask that He may be one with the Father; He asks that believers may be. The former unity is by nature, the latter by grace;" but we may add "tending to that of nature," and point to the τετελειωμένοι εἰς ἕν, ver. 23. Augustine distinguishes still more precisely, Non ait, ut *nobiscum* sint unum, aut *simus* unum *ipsi et nos*, sicut unum sumus nos.—Finally, let it be observed that as the Lord had *never* previously united Himself with men by any *We*, in the presence of God and in relation to Him, so even in this prayer, which finally embraces His disciples all in one, and unites them most fully to Himself, He still utters no such

[1] That Christ should be one with the Father, as the deniers of His Divinity say, κατὰ τὴν δύναμιν καὶ διάθεσιν τῆς ὁμοφρονίας.

"*We*," but on the contrary places Himself with God in another *We* which is distinguished from that. And this, too, in *prayer*, which makes it still more emphatic than in ch. xiv. 23. But, again, in this unity of nature there is still the distinction ἐγὼ καὶ σύ.[1]

Ver. 12. Φυλάσσειν is manifestly more than τηρεῖν, inasmuch as it makes prominent the more specific *protection against* present danger which is included in the more general idea of *preservation*. It is true that afterwards, when no longer in the world by visible, audible, human presence, the Son Himself keeps and defends His own—see ch. x. 28–30. But there is yet a difference, so that He who is going presently to return and remain can truly say, When I was with them—as we have found and expounded this in the previous chapters. Again, this bold expression (as Cyril observed) in which the Lord makes His own and the Father's keeping one, must rest upon their equal power and dignity.[2] To the Holy Father, Keep Thou—as a Divine work; and now, I have hitherto kept! Who, leaving the world, could thus speak to God but He who is One with Him? Peter's denial, the offence and forsaking of all, were already in ver. 8 prophetically overlooked, as no real apostasy; it now comes out more strongly that the Eleven are, notwithstanding, those who are kept and not lost. But the one miserable apostate—the good Shepherd thinks of him now, and it is a drop of sorrow in the cup of His joy—now once more, and this once only, since the νῦν ἐδοξάσθη of ch. xiii. 31. Here lies the deep mystery of evil, which continues even after redeeming grace, yea, continues to strive *against* it. Did not Jesus *desire*, as much as in Him lay, to preserve and save even Judas also? Does He say—Whom I have let go, given up! or anything equivalent to that? God forbid! *On the contrary He here*

[1] On which it was scarcely for Bengel to say, "Nor is it befitting that believers in praying to the Father and the Son should say *Ye*. Which language, however, some practical divines use." The living exercise of prayer can address and invoke only the one God, whether in the Father, or in the Son, or (as the Spirit has taught the Church) in the Holy Ghost.

[2] "What our Saviour here says could be said by no man, by no angel, of himself. It was impossible to every creature, God alone could keep His own in His name.—*I have kept them in Thy name* is widely different from whatever the most faithful servant of God could do." A. H. Francke.

calls to witness what He had done for His disciples as a justification of Himself against what might have the appearance of neglect. It must be admitted that εἰ μή elsewhere sometimes stands merely for ἀλλά, without introducing any exception to what precedes; but the simple reader must yield to the conviction that the one is here excepted from the twelve. The broken number of the Apostles is referred to throughout as one—with *them*, I have kept *them*, and so, not one *of them;* and the thought and feeling of the Lord in this prayer is precisely the same as in the previous expression of His sorrow—*One of you*, ch. xiii. 21.[1] This is the one, who was chosen and yet not chosen—the former being as real as the latter. This one did *not* comply with that condition which was already described in ver. 6 as the decision of man's freedom corresponding to His grace—*the keeping the word. Therefore* he is *lost*, ἀπώλετο—which must assuredly be taken in strict connection with the δέδωκας. The Lord bears this *witness* against him, while He mourns over him before the Father, and appeals to His own fidelity—*I* have not neglected him![2] Thus this word stands in the High-priestly prayer, with all its profound, solemn, weighty significance of *warning:*—Let no man depend upon the keeping of the Father and the Son, or upon the intercession of the High Priest, as upon an *irresistible grace* which will render this *being lost* impossible.

Jesus *names* not the lost one, for several reasons: through sorrow (as in ch. xiii. 26)—because he is reprobate (Ps. xvi. 4)—but, finally, because his person is regarded as the *type* of all whom the Lord sees in the future as lost with him. This last is assumed afterwards by the Holy Ghost, 2 Thess. ii. 3, where the Antichrist who will close the series receives the condemning name of his forerunner—*son of perdition.* This construction as derived from the Hebrew בֵּן is plain enough; but it is too often forgotten that it involves as its fundamental principle the necessary attribution of personal guilt, the note of what is *a man's own*, and out of which springs his character and his fate. Thus we have בֶּן־בְּלִיַּעַל, בֶּן־עֲיָלָה, בֶּן־מָוֶת—in Isa. lvii. 4, יְלְדֵי־פֶשַׁע Sept.

[1] Glassius, incorrectly: Non excipitur ex Christo datorum numero Judas, sed iis tantum opponitur per adversativam.

[2] Nos sane Individuorum amissorum reddemus rationem. Bengel.

τέκνα ἀπωλείας, parallel with זֶרַע שָׁקֶר[1]—Ecclus. xvi. 9, ἔθνος ἀπωλείας—in the New Testament υἱὸς γεέννης, Matt. xxiii. 15, υἱοὶ τῆς ἀπειθείας, Eph. ii. 2, but also υἱὸς εἰρήνης, Lu. x. 6, τέκνα ὑπακοῆς, 1 Pet. i. 14. Thus in the υἱὸς is involved the *unsalvability* of this lost one, and his own guilt,[2] as in 2 Thess. ii. 3, ἄνθρωπος τῆς ἁμαρτίας precedes as the principle and reason of the perdition. Further the ἀπώλεια after the ἀπώλετο is by no means tautological—I have lost none but him who is lost!—but as in the first place the being lost included the perdition, so now the latter is made prominent by the ἀπώλεια; and, penetrating more deeply into the root of the matter, the *damnation* is viewed as one with the *sin*. Ἀπώλεια is at the same time פֶּשַׁע as in Isa. lvii. This expression paves the way for the πονηρόν, ver. 15, and regards the sin and all its consequences as one, and it is of great significance (for the right interpretation of ver. 15 afterwards) that the Lord does not descend in this prayer to mention the author of sin, the *father of perdition*,[3] but abides in the abstraction, albeit an abstraction very concrete.

Having come to that dark boundary where sin and its resulting perdition contends even against His grace, the Lord finds His solace, now as ever, in the foreseeing counsel of the Father, which, while it never could will sin, nevertheless victoriously takes it up into its purposes of grace to the saved. I have foretold thee of this—such consolation in such experience needed even the Son as man. The quotation of *Scripture* as referring to Judas[4] has the same force here as in ch. xiii. 18; but here there is a broader view of all those passages of Scripture generally which prophesy of this Judas personally, and of that which was illustrated in him—the being loved in vain and lost. The word does indeed primarily refer to specific prophecy concerning

[1] To which passage there may be direct allusion here. But not, as Lange thinks, that the Scripture here said to be fulfilled is to be found in this chapter (where the plurals gradually pass into the singular), especially vers. 12, 13. There are other and plainer *Scriptures* which point to Judas' person!

[2] Braune, therefore, contradicts the text, when he says—"He calls him *son*, and that is His love; but *lost*, that is His holiness."

[3] As Nonnus inaptly interjects εἰ μὴ δαιμονίου φθισήνορος υἱὸς ὀλέθρου.

[4] Concerning which Bahrdt said, Who can mistake the marginal gloss here?!

this *son of perdition:* we must not forget this, and think with Junius that "Jesus regarded the universal truth of the law of Moses and the Prophetical Scriptures, and their unanimous consent in this, *that not all* to whom the word of God was preached *should be saved.*" Again, what Braune says remains true, "Jesus caused it not, still less the Scripture, least of all God"—but Judas himself, although a child of Satan, is at the same time the author and father of his own sin and his own perdition, as ἀπολλύμενος and ἀπολωλώς the *son* and heir of his self-willed ruin.

Ver. 13. I come to Thee—see on ver. 11. We have already admitted that our Lord, as He here plainly says, prayed aloud in the hearing of His disciples for their instruction and comfort:—the λαλῶ[1] with ἵνα makes it here undeniable. *In the world;* that is, He *utters* this prayer now finally before His coming to the Father, pre-eminently for His own in the world.[2] And this shows, as Lücke observes, the difference between the intercession in this world and that continued *in the other.* For the Son will above speak to the Father, and before Him, otherwise than here below in the flesh: there is an antithesis which nevertheless rests upon their essential unity; for *these things* are the same which He here would begin to say, and will there continue to say. Concerning the fulfilment of Christ's joy in His disciples, see upon chap. xv. 11 and xvi. 24. Here there is a direct anticipation of this glorious end of all. "This Highpriestly intercession is the object and the ground of never-failing joy." Who can, indeed, apprehend himself by faith to be included in it, without an increase of joy in the faith which *anticipates* victory and eternal glory, just as it was anticipated in this prayer uttered then in the world? Jesus did not even now think only of His first disciples:—we hear St John, 1 John i. 4, appropriating to all believers the promise of a joy which is full, and yet ever increasing; and in his private Epistle hoping that *his own* spoken words may, through the grace of his Lord, con-

[1] To which Nonnus adds very improperly a σοί: καὶ τάδε σοὶ ξύμπαντα διήϊον—All this have I said *to Thee*, O Father!

[2] What other mysteries in yet higher words, or in silence, might He have spoken of to His Father, if His aim had not been to speak all *for us*, that *we* also might know his intercessory prayer! Comp. Schmieder, S. 148.

tribute to the fulness of the disciple's joy, 2 John 12. That which the intercession of Jesus prayed and assured to His own, is made in the hands of the Spirit a blessing distributed in ever-increasing measure to all. Whosoever speaks and writes under the benediction of this discourse of Jesus increases and fulfils the *joy* of those who hear and read. And especially whosoever can *pray* after this pattern of all liturgical service and prayer!

Vers. 14–16. The *goal* of perfect *joy*, of that *peace* the principle of which through their union with Christ by faith is already given to them, and which will increase more and more, has now been expressed. But the great *danger of the way* has had a fearful exhibition in that One among the Twelve! We know already how the Lord had applied this example to the humiliation and warning of the rest. Hence the intercession now first begins with definite precision, entering more deeply and plainly into the necessity of their condition:—*Keep* them—from the *evil!* First stands the repetition of the foundation, vers. 6–8, on which His petition rests—I have, on My part, given them Thy word! Indeed, this is enough, enough for the foundation of their defence, in this *one treasure* lies *all*—that is, with the Spirit (as is more plainly expressed in ver. 17), who is regarded by anticipation as being already in the word. Nevertheless, there is connected with this *beneficium* an *incommodum inde natum* (as Lampe says)—Therefore the world hateth them! Let all that was said upon ch. xv. 19, 20 be called to mind; and especially that the hatred for the word's sake falls upon the persons, because of the difference in character of which those who hold it bear witness. The hatred of the world is the always resulting consequence, in the degree in which the word has been given to us:—hence ἐμίσησεν parallel with δέδωκα. But now comes the disclosure of the reason—*For* they are not of the world. As there was in ch. xv. 19, the emphatically repeated designation of this relation, so now we have the same before and after, in ver. 14 and ver. 16, as the reason of the petition coming between in ver. 15. *As I*—on this comparison and reason we have spoken already upon ch. xv. After the creation of the new man, which is now their proper *person*, after their union with Christ through the regeneration by the word, they are no longer of the world. He Himself, otherwise than we, was originally not of it: "Dur

ing the whole time of His being in the world, He had not been, for one moment, of the world—but had been elevated above it in kingly majesty." (Albertini.) But in the case of the disciples, the same world which hateth them hath still something of its own in their hearts. *This* is the inmost reason why they must remain in the world; they must pursue the conflict into victory.

I pray not that Thou shouldst take them (now at once, with Me) out of the world! This also He speaks, most assuredly, for the instruction of the hearers of His prayer. He thus admits that it might be reasonable to ask this: on the one hand, it must appear to the disciples a good and desirable thing, while, on the other hand, He by declining such a prayer intimates that it would be the reverse. He gives them to understand that they should yet remain a long time in the world, even after He had gone to the Father. Not, therefore, as that premature wish, ch. xiii. 37, desired; not as their somewhat clearer apprehension might now earnestly prefer, "How good for us if He would remove us with Himself" (Francke). So, also, contrary to the deep desire which all His future disciples would feel;—a desire which is not to be compared, however, with that of Elijah, oppressed by despondency (1 Kings xix. 4), nor to be regarded as the desire of lethargy and idleness, but such as the Apostle expressed in Phil. i. 23. In their first conversion and joy almost all more or less feel a desire to be at once with Him above, as Albertini's hymn sings, "I have seen Thy throne, Lord, from afar, and would fain be with Thee; gladly would I commit to Thee, Creator of Spirits, my weary life." And often we think concerning others, Well for them now to die, for then they would be safe in heaven! But the Lord knows better, and we should learn a better lesson from His words on this occasion. He asks not for this; then ask it not thyself, either for thyself or for others! Reply with the Apostle to thine own desire to depart, Nevertheless it is *better*, for it is more *needful*, to remain in the flesh and in the world. Content thyself with praying for thy *preservation*, until thou *hast* fulfilled all thy work, and *art* thyself made perfect.

And this gives us the two reasons, which pass into each other, for which it was better that they should remain. First, believers are to continue the witness and work of the Lord in

the world, like Paul they must have fruit of their labours. Luther makes this the prominent reason, "The question must not be of their going out of the world with Me; for I have much to do by their means, My kingdom to spread, and My little flock to be increased." But with this must be connected the other; only in the struggle to accomplish this are *we ourselves* perfected and *sanctified;* thus only do we bring forth fruit unto our own ripe fitness for heaven. As the same hymn of Albertini proceeds: "But I am sinful, still stooping to the earth, and this His Holy Spirit hath taught me most convincingly; I must abide in this world yet longer that I may be wholly sanctified by His Spirit, my mind must learn to enter more deeply into His, my feet must learn to stand immovably!" For a believer to accomplish his final salvation, and reach the haven without making shipwreck of faith, is no light thing, but possible only through the power of the intercession of the Mediator, and the strength of God obtained through Him. "Men wonder when a believer falls; but they should much more wonder to see him stand fast to the end, and finish his course with joy." (Hofacker.) But the great *prize*, the full fruit, of our discipline is this, to be able to say throughout the conflict and at the end—But in all these we are *more than conquerors!* Rom. viii. 37.

All this is sufficiently grounded and explained in the petition —But that Thou wouldst keep them *from the evil.* Is the *evil* masculine or neuter? Many from the earliest times have assumed the former, regarding the Lord as pointing to the great enemy from whom the disciples are to be defended; Bengel is among them, as was also Nonnus before him.[1] Wesley corrects the Eng. trans. *from the evil* into *from the evil one.* But our opinion is different, and we hold to Luther's translation. There are passages, such as 2 Thess. iii. 3, which speak of the *evil one;* but the sense and connection are not the same in them. In 1 John v. 19 (which is generally adduced as decisive), the *evil one* is not referred to, for he had been mentioned in the previous verse; there is the same connection there as here between the πονηρόν and the κόσμος, and what is meant

[1] Ἀλλ' ἵνα μιν βλεφάροισιν ἀκοιμήτοισι φύλαξῃς δαίμονος ἀρχεκάκοιο δυσαντήτων ἀπὸ θεσμῶν.

is the *evil* which that *evil one* had brought into the world, and into which he had brought the world, so that it now lies fast in it. Rosenmüller well says; It is the neuter, with allusion to the masculine which precedes. It would be a strange thing to read there—*lieth in the wicked one.* The ἐν in this passage perfectly corresponds with the ἐκ in ours; and this opposes the reference to Satan, since elsewhere we find only τηρεῖν ἀπὸ—excepting in Rev. iii. 10 where ἐκ τῆς ὥρας of temptation has the same meaning as here, something being indicated in which they are found who are to be saved out of it by preservation.

We gave our reasons in Vol. i. for not understanding *the evil one* to be mentioned in the last petition of the Lord's Prayer, referring to the important parallel, 2 Tim. iv. 17, 18; and had previously exhibited upon Matt. v. 39 the fundamental idea of πονηρόν as used by our Lord. The repugnance which we there expressed to the introduction of the conquered enemy, is strengthened when he is regarded as entering into this final prayer of victory and glorification. Luthardt may utter his protest, and declare it to be most appropriate that both in the Lord's Prayer and in this the devil should be alluded to—*de gustibus non est disputandum.* We regard it as a very important argument for our view, that the Lord is here dealing with the simply impersonal *neutral*, and general fundamental elements both of evil and good. First, we have the two designations in strict parallel, ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου—ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ. As far as the disciples are still *in the world* (ver. 11), they are also *in the evil*, but they are to be sanctified *in the truth*, ver. 17. These are all plain correlatives; and moreover we have seen that in ver. 12 the neuter *perdition* is used, the name of the author, the destroyer, being however avoided. Olshausen thinks the ἐκ, as parallel with ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου, decisive against explaining it of the devil: "If the Lord had intended to bring a personality into the parallel, He would have been more pointed in designating him, for instance, by *prince of this world.*" And certainly this name was near enough at hand! So B.-Crusius thinks the ἐκ more appropriate to the neuter. Throughout the whole New Testament we have the τηρεῖν, with such a qualification, only in Jas. i. 27, besides this passage and Rev. iii. 10; there it is with ἀπό, which generally accompanies φυλάσσειν,

and ἀπό would stand here also, if Luther's simple view "*against* the evil" were quite correct. It is certain that ἐκ, in the unusual pregnant construction of this passage, has a corresponding ἐν to be supplied, which could refer only to πονηρόν.[1] Even Lampe, unlike the Reformed, prefers here and in the Lord's Prayer, the neuter.[2]

The evil is really the same comprehensive term here as there: —*sin*, the "malitia mundana" (though not with Grotius' external application, who explains ἐκ by *ab*) is the ground, as we find *evil world* in Gal. i. 4: but it *includes* all the miserable fruits and consequences of sin, from the equally *tempting* as profitable κακία of every day (Matt. vi. 34), up to the tremendous ἀπώλεια of eternity. In Joseph's word, Gen. xxxix. 9, הָרָעָה הַגְּדֹלָה is the first prelude of this sense; for even there his meaning was that to sin against God must bring upon him greater ruin and evil than his refusal to do it. Only by taking His disciples fully out of the elemental evil of sin, can Jesus make them perfectly happy; but this is not attained by the taking away of the unsanctified prematurely out of the world. The τηρεῖν ἐκ—is a pregnant construction of great significance, by which the immediately following ἁγιάζειν is prepared for. A. H. Francke says in explanation, "That Thou wouldst keep them, as they are fast in the midst of the evil; and keep them in such a manner that they may come out of the evil finally unharmed and unsullied"—but "in the midst" is too strong, the meaning is their being helped *entirely out of it:* the saving preservation is only the continuation and completion of their first deliverance, and election out of the world. "The preservation in the name of God is their preservation in that which sanctifies the disciples; their defence against the evil is their defence against that which would defile them"—says Schmieder; but it must not be forgotten that the progressive *sanctification* itself presupposes in them the unholiness which has yet to be entirely taken away.

When ver. 16 follows again upon this, the design is to obviate the error of putting too strong a construction upon the fellowship of the disciples with the *evil;* and, further, the

[1] Brückner admits that the ἐκ would be more appropriate to the neuter.

[2] Evil as well physical as moral—he says, inexactly indeed; for the latter is not the root of the former, and in the *perdition* both are one.

Master would in this teaching prayer say for all futurity—All ye for whom I pray must be right in this respect above all! Apply to yourselves this test! Similarly, we may say that what in ver. 14 is the ground of the world's hatred, is here made the reason for His prayer being heard. But the former explanation goes more deeply into the matter.

Ver. 17. The connection with what precedes, the development of this prayer from the previous, is to be sought in this important consideration:—There is still something of the *world* in them; they are still *in the evil*, as not only afflicted and tempted from without, but also from within; they are not yet altogether released from this element of the world (go back to chap. xvi. 33, and mark the deep meaning of *in the world* there). Therefore they need to be *sanctified:* first, for their own sake and in themselves; then also, as ver. 18 shows, for the sake of the world, and for their mission to it. In fact, this *sanctify them* in connection with *I sanctify Myself*, ver. 19, is the proper *centre* of the whole prayer; nor must we let that be taken away by any superficial interpretation of this word. Assuredly, ἁγιάζειν as corresponding to the O. T. קִדֵּשׁ and הִקְדִּישׁ, means primarily—To separate for God, to consecrate; and so far is used with reference to impersonal things in the region of rites and types, as we find it also used by our Lord, Matt. xxiii. 17, 19. But in the New-Testament fulfilment this typical phraseology discloses all its meaning; and is no longer used with lower application, except by way of transition, as in the holy *city*, the holy covenant, holy place, τὸ ἅγιον, Matt. vii. 6. Thenceforward, it is used in what we call its moral meaning, consecration to God through separation from sin. Even in 1 Cor. vii. 14, and Rom. xi. 16, it has this meaning in part. And can we suppose that here, where the Lord is speaking out of the very centre of New-Testament truth and fulfilment, a typical and external idea was all that He attached to the word? It is in vain that B.-Crusius decrees, "We *cannot* think, with Grotius, of a moral sanctification:"—nothing else can possibly satisfy the Lord's meaning. If we understand—*Separate them*, and the question arises, *from what?* the answer is at hand—*from the evil.* If we read first, in the Old-Testament sense (which indeed has its truth), *Consecrate them*, and then ask *to what?* the connection with the *fol-*

lowing verse is not enough; we must carefully observe all that precedes, and that will lead us to the full preservation and salvation from sin for the *holy* Father. It may be said (with Hammond, Semler, Kuinoel): They were to be consecrated and separated to their vocation of teaching, their mission to the world[1]—but in the mouth of Christ that very consecration can be no other than what the entire New Testament terms sanctification. A reference to ver. 19 may oblige us to admit a *priestly* consecration of those who were to be sent, as Lampe, following Theophyl. and Ammon, maintained; but, as he allows, the New-Testament priests are now sanctified *truly* and *in the truth.* The same word applies to us all; but how shall the priests of God bring for themselves or for others spiritual sacrifices excepting as sanctified from their sins? Finally, let it be weighed well that the Lord has already acknowledged much and great things in regard to His disciples—They are Thine, O Father,—no more of the world,—They are given to Me,—I am glorified in them; but He never says concerning them—They *are* already sanctified. But, after all that, would a *consecration* have been wanting, understood, that is, as a mere external separation and setting apart? If taken out of the world, if they had been given to God and to Christ, that must have already taken place? In fact, so far as they are already pure through the word given unto them (ch. xv. 3), and Christ lives in them through the commencement of their world-renouncing faith, they are already sanctified in the sense of 1 Cor. vi. 11—but that is not enough for the ἁγίασον yet in reserve, which must be explained according to 2 Cor. vii. 1; Acts xxvi. 18, xx. 32.

The great *means* of this sanctification, by which also the internal, moral meaning of the expression is established, is the *truth*, that is, the *word* of truth, just as in Acts xx. 32. Doubtless, as we have hinted before, *in the truth* here means, *primarily* and in transition, *truly*, *really*, in opposition to the prophetic type; but to go no further than this[2] is wrong, on the other

[1] And Chrysostom: "Separate them to the word and preaching." But he adds, "their own sanctification seems to be something different from that." Theophylact says plainly, "Make them holy."

[2] This is all Luther *expresses*, but its meaning is right: "May they be soundly sanctified by Thee"—referring to Eph. iv. 24 also.

hand, being inconsistent with the added *Thy* truth. Lachmann's text, indeed (and the Vulg.), omits this important σοῦ; but the omission is to be accounted for by a wish to conform this verse to ver. 19: as *transitional*, however, to the explanatory "*Thy word* is truth," it could not be wanting here. (Even if spurious it must be supplied in the thought.) Such superficialities as taking ἐν for ϟ, ergo veritati, *i.e.*, ministerio ejus, and Meyer's *in the service of the truth*, condemn themselves, when we only consider the depth of meaning which ἐν has in the New Testament and in St John, and which certainly it retains to the full in this chapter. Nor is this ἐν the *per* of Erasmus, as Lücke thinks, "by means of"—turn to ch. iv. 23 and ch. viii. 31, 32 again! The *truth*, or the revealed, communicated reality of the knowledge of God is the *element* or medium of sanctification; the *word* which contains this truth, yea, is identical with it, becomes then the *means* or medium in another sense. The truth of God is pre-eminently all that which Christ hath said, see vers. 6, 8, 14, ch. viii. 40, xviii. 37. But Christ included, too, the ancient word of God, confirming and fulfilling it; and therefore "*Thy* truth" and "*Thy* word" embrace even here every Old-Testament word also, concerning which Ps. cxix. 160 gloried—*Thy word is true from the beginning*, or—The sum, the essential substance of Thy word, is Truth! But the former interpretation of this last passage declares that even the beginning of the word of God, of Scripture, is pure revealed truth, the witness of God against all delusion and error.

But now it is obvious that "if the word of God is thus consecrated as a *sanctifying* medium," it receives this consecration as a living word, not regarded therefore as without and independent of the *Spirit*. For every word without the Spirit is a lie; but God's word to men was never from the beginning without the Spirit in it and with it (even the law was λόγια ζῶντα, Acts vii. 38). Even the believing and waiting keeping of the word which precedes the outpouring of the Spirit—who gives life to *us* as well as to the word—is not possible without a preliminary participation of the Spirit of the word. Not as a letter, but by its spirit, the Old-Testament word imperfectly sanctified all who were, and as far as they were, sanctified; on the other hand, the hold-

ing fast and perverting the letter without sincerity of heart, and without entering into the truth of the word—was turned into the most fearful lie (1 Jno. ii. 4), and crucified the incarnate Word Himself. Thus we understand how far the Lord attributes to the previous word the beginning of a sanctification, while He prays for that fulfilment of it which the Old Testament was not capable of producing:—prays anticipatingly that the Father, when the *Spirit* shall have been sent with the perfect words which the Son had spoken, would sanctify His own more and more, even unto perfection, in this full living reality of the word. Though *the Holy Ghost* is not named throughout this prayer—remarkable enough after the previous discourses!—because the Lord prays altogether in the Spirit, yet it must not be forgotten that in all the influences and energies of grace which are prayed for, from the first *giving of life* to the final *union and glorification*, nothing else is meant and prayed for but the selfsame Holy Spirit. The entire prayer prays in the Spirit for the Spirit; and in this centre of it the *truth*, which is regarded as one with the *word*, can have no other meaning than that we found in the *Spirit and truth*, of ch. iv. 23. Did not the Lord, in the great promise which preceded the prayer, expressly term the Paraclete the *Spirit of the truth!* If there in the beginning this referred especially, yea almost exclusively, to a revelation to knowledge, to true teaching, so we see now at the end that the word deepens its meaning, and that Spirit of *the* truth becomes actually a most profound and all-embracing name. The truth and reality of the self-communication of God to man, which quickens and sanctifies by means of the word offered to his knowledge, is now the Spirit (1 Jno. v. 6)—and is at the same time the glorified *word*, as lifegiving as it is living.[1] This last ὁ λόγος ὁ σός should be pondered by all who talk about the Lord's intercession for a Spirit and a truth *independent* of the canonical word which is here strictly bound up with it, as given by God through the prophets and finally by His Son.

But the prayed-for *sanctification*, although it proceeds throughout the whole life of believers, cannot be made in the fullest sense perfect before death; for death remains as the final test

[1] Which may be supplementarily added to what was already said upon ch. xiv. 17.

of faith and its perseverance, and this full consummation embraces really the reception of the inheritance—just as is signified by *among those who are sanctified* in Acts xxvi. 18, and according to the comprehensive sense of *they who are sanctified*, Heb. ii. 11. It is the Son who sanctifies us in Himself; it is the Father who sanctifieth us through the Son in the Spirit; specifically and conclusively it is thus the Spirit, as the living truth of God, who produces this sanctification. But, on the other hand, as before the defence, so now the sanctification, of believers is not without their own faith and fidelity, their *obedience to the truth.* (1 Pet. i. 15, 16, 22.) Hence the Spirit Himself exhorts, as in St John's first Epistle, "He that hath this hope in Him—*purifieth himself*," ch. iii. 3. (In this ἁγνίζειν mark, at the same time, the true meaning of ἁγιάζειν!) And in ch. v. 18, 19 of that Epistle this *sanctifieth himself* is connected with *keeping himself*, as *not sinning*, as the entire deliverance *from the evil* in which the world lieth—so that we have at the close of the companion Epistle, as it were, a specific quotation and exposition of the very words with which the Gospel here closes.

Ver. 18. Now first, after having referred to the necessity of a sanctification for the disciples themselves, in order to their being fully delivered from every ψεῦδος, the Lord directs His view to their official vocation, as strictly bound up with their personal advancement in faith. (Acts xx. 24; 2 Tim. iv. 7.) The Lord here anticipates the word which was afterwards spoken, ch. xx. 21 (which directly and fully could not be spoken to them until after the Resurrection); and in this word their calling, their appointment, their need, advance to a higher meaning. He does not merely *leave* them in the world, He *sends* them to it and into it! He appoints them not merely to keep there the word itself, to receive it fully in its truth to the sanctification of their own persons, but to carry about this word as a testimony (Acts viii. 15); to continue their testimony to the truth, as He Himself in ch. xviii. 37. But the personal and official calling are ever one in their several spheres; and most certainly so in the Apostles, as their name testifies. It is only in the world, while we live and contend in it as not of it, and keep ourselves in the word of truth, that our full sanctification is possible. As He Himself in the flesh overcame through conflict, and by true obedience sowed the

seed which was now to produce the full harvest of His glory—so also is it with us. He here condescends to equality with us, in respect to His mission in His humanity; afterwards in ver. 19 His own specific *I sanctify Myself* follows, in which we must recognise the great distinction which subsists in this equality. *To bear fruit* in ourselves and also in others, is but one and the same; even as He, while He was Himself perfected, at the same time perfected all. (Heb. v. 9; x. 14.) This we have already seen in the parable of the vine.[1] Assuredly, this mission to the world applies, according to his ability, to the most private individual, who goes most quietly through life, working out his own salvation—for how can any one be a light in the world without diffusing his light; how can he have the graces of Christ without making them known; how can he be sanctified in the truth, without bearing witness for the truth? Again, who can be sanctified without the discipline of this conflict with the unholy world? Thus we have here the strongest reason why He will not take His own out of the world; why we should not wish to forsake the society of men, and be at rest before the time; why we should rather persevere in our mission, *as He did!* (1 Jno. iv. 17.) The distinction in this similarity between Him and us is already denoted in this, that now the *Son* sendeth His own, even as the Father had sent Him. Thus through us, as the Father's *subdelegates*, so to speak, the work upon earth proceeds, so far as it has yet to be accomplished.—Nevertheless, with all this co-reference of the word to *future* disciples, the Lord's view rests in ver. 18 upon these first, specific *Apostles*;[2] on which account in ver. 20 its express extension is resumed—*Not for these* only.

Ver. 19. But before this there is one solitary, but all-comprehensive word in the middle of the prayer—the High-priestly ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν which lays the *foundation* for the περὶ αὐτῶν, as a conclusive testimony to His *redeeming work*, His *redeeming death*. Let us now seek rightly to understand this *I sanctify Myself!*

[1] Compare Rothe's Ethik. iii. 57.

[2] Luther: He hereby appoints His *Apostles* to be doctors and preachers, and binds us all to their words, whether we be learned or unlearned; so that, however wise we may be, we must humble ourselves to let these poor fishermen teach us and guide us, hearing them as we would Christ Himself.

According to ch. x. 36 the Father had already *sanctified* Him, in sending Him into the world; from His birth He had been the Holy One of God in the unholy world. This *I sanctify Myself* in the *present* tense cannot, therefore, refer generally to His vocation and mission generally, to His whole life of teaching and action.[1] A sanctification from sin He needed not like us! Luther says to the simple, or to the perverse, "Thou must not understand this word as if He was to become holy in a sense in which He was not so before; for He was holy in His mother's womb, Lu. i. 35." This is sufficiently obvious; but how is the same word used of Him, which had just been used of us? It is plain at the outset, that He in a certain sense condescends to fellowship with them; and we must, first of all, and before a deeper meaning is established, content ourselves with Grotius' explanation—He repeats the word *sanctify* in a sense somewhat changed.

But what is that sense? Here recurs the same fundamental idea of the קֹדֶשׁ and הִקְדִּישׁ derived from the O. T., and which we showed to be the first meaning of the word; that meaning is now brought to its full fulfilment in the sanctification of the *Priest* and the *sacrifice*, the ἐμαυτόν showing that Christ is both in one. I consecrate, devote Myself as the Lamb of God to sacred, sacrificial service:—such is the main meaning, as the Apostles might and must have understood it. Chrys., I bring before Thee an offering. Euthym., I voluntarily sacrifice Myself. And thus have most orthodox expositors understood it down to our own day; and rightly so, for consecration to God, and offering to God, is really the common fundamental idea in

[1] As Lücke rightly remarks, against the Socinians and Rationalists—He had not in this sense sanctified and sent Himself, but the Father had sanctified and sent Him. Thus the interpretation is false, which Heumann, Semler, Kuinoel, and De Wette advocate—"I have consecrated Myself to Thee, to Thy ministry; I have undertaken for their sake the office of Thy ambassador." Semler's "I have altogether devoted and consecrated Myself in their place and for their sake," may bear a good meaning, though he is wrong in making that all. Hezel has given a lamentable interpretation: "For their sake I have exhibited Myself in extraordinary ways, by a life of virtue and the greatest miracles, by the strange vicissitudes of My lot:—for their sake, that they may know My doctrine to be Divine, worthy of their acceptation, and of the many sacrifices in which it may involve them."

vers. 17 and 19. But this by no means exhausts the reason of the use of the same word in both cases. Olshausen says too much: "But the respective position of Christ and His disciples requires us to assume that ἁγιάζειν as used concerning *Him* means *only* to 'consecrate;' while as used of the disciples it must have the subordinate idea of a preparatory sanctification of nature." For *making holy* is the essential, irremovable idea of ἁγιάζειν, it is not a subordinate idea which may be removed from it; the connection between *His* ἁγιάζειν and *ours* is once more brought most impressively forward in this same verse, in the too-often-overlooked but most emphatic ἵνα καὶ αὐτοί—. Consequently, there must be even in Him *something corresponding* to our purification and deliverance from sin; something which is the fundamental, essential *ground* of the latter. The common theory of atonement, which does not penetrate into the living oneness of the true humanity of Christ with the fallen children of Adam, will never be able to understand this memorable saying; for it leaves Jesus apart in His holiness, just where He nevertheless, descending to and penetrating our humanity, *sanctifies* Himself for us;—with all its words about the mediation and substitution of Christ, it has no true notion of His actually taking our place. Christ's standing in our stead necessarily involves this, that the doing away and overcoming of sin must be the fundamental idea even in His own ἁγιάζειν. Does He only so bear and atone for the sin of the world, does He only so perfect the purging of our sins (Heb. i. 3), that the ἁμαρτία by imputation alone (then an impossible thing!) lies only *upon* Him? Is it not rather, according to all Scripture, *in* His flesh, the same flesh of sin in the ὁμοίωμα of which He was sent and was born; so that in *this* flesh, this human nature and human person of the *incarnate* Son, *sin* was condemned and done away? (Rom. viii. 3.) Hence Schmieder says unhesitatingly: "The self-sanctification of Jesus was, in this relation, subjected to the same conditions under which the sanctification of His disciples stands; it was necessary that He should offer up the human in Him as that which was contrary to God." This points us to the truth of that which is generally known as Menken's theory —to the truth which, rightly understood, is found in connection with much that is false. The author's theory (which must not

be confounded with Menken's !) is in some degree known, and cannot here be fully unfolded anew.[1] Thus much is certain, that we must, if we would do justice to this word, Jno. xvii. 19, admit, whether we understand it or not, a certain *sanctification*, renovation, or restoration of human nature *even in the very person of Christ*, as the root or germ of *our* sanctification:—by means of which He Himself was released from a certain *real connection with our sin*, and thus became the First-born of all the brethren sanctified in and through Himself. Rothe (in his Ethik ii. 307) approaches the truth of the matter, when he connects with the atonement for our sin by the "second Adam" the personal and perfected sanctification of the Redeemer Himself[2]—who thus through His absolute unity on the one side with God, and on the other side with mankind, becomes the sufficient principle or cause of sanctification to the sinful world of humanity. (Thus Rothe expounds, too, our present verse.) We must, however, protest against the strange, unscriptural notion which he blends with it as it regards the connection of the Holy Ghost with the true body of Christ; and, further, must add that He by means of His *flesh* bore *in and upon Himself* the power of sin which was to be overcome, the power of sin in humanity as fallen in Adam, a member of which humanity He must become in order to be its Head. Not indeed as positive, actual *sin*, but still in a real connection with that resisting power in it which gives occasion to the *warfare* and the *suffering* issuing in the victory of obedience. True, indeed, it is that He had never prayed to the Father, and does not now so pray—*Sanctify Thou Me!* but He could, and it was needful that He should, simply as the Holy One in the Spirit, from the beginning sanctify *Himself in the flesh*.[3] This self-sanctification, however, reached its proper perfection first in the *sufferings of death* (so that these are spoken of as His *being*

[1] I refer particularly, in connection with the Essay in the Andeutungen ii. S. 24, to my exposition of the Hebrews, where my first views have received much extension and modification. Lange also, rightly understood, will be found to be in accordance with them.

[2] Which Petersen (von der Kirche, i. 337) calls the discipline or asceticism of Christ, perfected in solitude.

[3] See the extract from Athanasius in Dorner S. 951, and Lampe also, who says almost the same.

perfected)—that passion of death in which the willing spirit subdues the weak flesh in sharp conflict of the soul coming between them, constraining it to the great offering and merit of an *obedience* which was *learned* and persevered in, Heb. v. 7, 8, x. 9, 10, 14. The Pres. ἁγιάζω speaks of this impending sacrifice in death as of such a sanctification, analogous with our own; the ὑπέρ in addition points back manifestly to the last *Supper*. (2 Cor. v. 15; Tit. ii. 14.) Thus only out of the death of Christ comes our new life, for the ὁμοίωμα of His death becomes efficient in us as our actual "dying to sin"—Rom. vi. 3–11;[1] 1 Pet. ii. 24. Thus we see the great truth of the words—*I sanctify Myself in order that they may be sanctified*; and it is only through this *in order to* that we reach our sanctification. I sanctify Myself for them—is not merely *more* than, I pray for them! That alone is the ground and strength of His intercession, which is here placed upon its true foundation for a testimony before us and before the Father. Before the Father—*Lo I come*, let My offering be well-pleasing to Thee! Thus was it prophetically and comprehensively said, when He came into the world (Heb. x. 5)—but now, when He is leaving the world and coming to the Father with the merit of His obedience, the blood of His sacrifice, the purging of our sins obtained by Himself, it becomes a full and decisive *truth*.

In proportion as *sin* becomes to us, through the fellowship of His holy and willing Spirit, a *bitterness*, we also are sanctified *in the truth*, essentially *in truth*. This is assuredly, *first*, and without the article still more evidently, ἀληθῶς, truly[2]—that is not, however, sufficient, but the word looks back to ver. 17. The *truth* of God is the objective element and goal of actual, essential sanctification. Still less does it suffice to understand this of the *sincere faith* with which we *on our part* lay hold of and appropriate the sacrifice of our Lord—this subjective

[1] If the death of *our sin* did not lie essentially and energetically in His death, how could it proceed therefrom as stated here, and elsewhere in the apostolical teaching?

[2] Mich. Weber: vere, *i.e.*, non typice, non symbolice. Bengel: In truth, although it may not externally appear. This is opposed to ceremonial holiness.

condition is only silently presupposed. Luther exhibits here a want of doctrinal clearness, arising from his anxiety to deduce everything connected with justification from faith "alone;" he speaks, indeed, properly enough of the fruits and works of faith, but he is lacking upon the scriptural *teaching* concerning *sanctification.*[1] He tells us on this passage, that we must preach here about nothing but *Christ's* sanctification (although Christ preaches of *ours!*)—"that we must simply hang on His word, and creep into Christ's sanctification." He most incorrectly imposes this meaning upon our passage, and goes on, "*therefore* it was that He so diligently repeated the words *in truth*, laying that down in opposition to all the world, and all human holiness. *My sanctification*, He saith, *maketh them truly holy.*" True, but would this *reckoning ourselves* (Rom. vi. 11) in apprehending faith *be* a truth, a true *sanctification*, if believers did not furthermore make that their end and object, which Rom. vi. 12–22 goes on in such amplitude to set forth? In 1 Cor. i. 30 there is a distinction between δικαιοσύνη and ἁγιασμός, which must be carefully noted; but the Lord speaks distinctively of the *latter*, of the great design to be perfectly accomplished in and by the justified. Euthymius is right in referring it to the idea of sacrifice—"in order that they also may be sacrificed in a true offering"—but this must be understood in the sense of Rom. xii. 1, 2; Eph. v. 1, 2. *Sanctified* are we first in the perfection of our obedience, likewise, when nothing but the holy will of Divine love dwells and lives in us, just as in Christ. Not forgiveness of sins and justification, which is only the ground and beginning, but sanctification unto entire unblamableness of our nature, is the goal, the end contemplated in the redeeming death of our Lord, Eph. i. 4, v. 25–27; Col. i. 22. But this design may be rendered abortive, even in the case of the justified, through *their* unfaithfulness; hence the urgent exhortations of the Paraclete in the word and in our hearts, and the intercessions

[1] I may assure Münchmeyer, who naturally enough takes offence at this, that I also with Luther understand sanctification to be no other than the fruit of faith; but I cannot find in Luther a sufficiently full development of all that the Scripture says concerning our own diligence and zeal, and their fruit and reward.

of the Paraclete above. Lampe maintains, according to the hard abstract logic of his theory of predestination, that "it follows from this connection that no sanctification is to be expected but through the merit of the sacrifice of Christ; and Jesus would lose the fruit of His death if any one, for whom He died, should not actually be sanctified; there is a *necessary* bond of connection between the death of Christ and the sanctification of the elect, which the Lord's train of thought takes for granted;"—but all this shows that he did not rightly read the *ἵνα*, for the sense of which we point to Jno. i. 7, iii. 17, and even Rom. xi. 32. As if the branches had not been spoken of which abide not in Him, and, just before, a Judas given to Him, watched over, and yet lost! As if the Scripture, Rom. xiv. 15; 2 Pet. ii. 11, and elsewhere, did not testify literally concerning the lost for whom nevertheless Christ died, and whom He had bought![1] Consequently, Christ merely sanctifies Himself for all, *to the end that* all may be capable of sanctification. It is true that He now prays only for His own, whose faith and perseverance He contemplates in anticipation; but while His thought here penetrates into the depth of this *fundamental work* of salvation, He is impelled to enlarge the range of His intercession, as widely as the testimony itself in ver. 21—*That* the world may believe.

Thus we have now the widest comprehension *of all future believers*, brought to faith by the continued mediation of the word, down to the end. Not only so, we have at the same time the *prosecution* of the previous intercession up to its ultimate end in glory. The glorious conclusion of the prayer, as it stretches forward into eternity, can only in eternity be fully understood. As, to the Lord Himself, His closely impending sufferings were merged in His *glorification*, so now—

[1] It is quite consistent with this quotation, that, defending the doctrine of final perseverance against the Lutherans, Lampe appends to ver. 15 the strange and melancholy restriction, that the Lord did not pray against their foreseen, permitted, and thus *appointed* sin—but only against their *peccata graviora!* Such a system is in practice altogether untenable, misapprehends St John's *that ye sin not*, and takes away all force from the law, *Sin not!* Compare what Thiersch (Kathol. u. Protest. ii. Aufl. ii. 141 ff.) says upon these dangerous extravagances of Reformed teaching.

after the intimations of vers. 14–19, in which *their* sufferings and struggles appear as their sanctification—He says nothing more of their *afflictions in the world*, of their entering through much tribulation the kingdom of God. After ver. 17 it only remained to pray for the *glorification* of His own in Him, the consummation and manifestation of that which was spoken of in ver. 10; but He takes as the way to this (what was hinted at in ver. 11) their *being united in one*, from which their glorification, not properly to be first prayed for, follows as His own and His Father's will. Hence we may say that He first *prays for* the *unity* of all who should believe in Him and the Father (vers. 20, 21), and then He immediately *gives*, *promises*, *appoints* the *glory* of these thus united in one (that glory being in vers. 22, 23, regarded as already internally present in them, and as beaming forth upon the world in their unity, while in ver. 24 it is regarded as to be revealed in the future); thus passing altogether from praying (now become a θέλω, *I will*) into the final *promise* of vers. 25, 26, which, again, connects itself with the present of these first disciples, excluding once more the unbelieving world.

Ver. 20. *All these things* is obviously to be supplied after the *I pray;* so that the extension of His view to His future disciples appropriates to them also all that He had just said, as on the other hand the continuation of His prayer refers also to His first disciples. *Through their word* ascribes to all future disciples the same basis for our Lord's intercession which in vers. 6–8 had been assigned as the reason of His intercession for the Apostles; and in ver. 21 the first disciples themselves are again merged in the *all*. Could there be a permanent and essential distinction among those who *believe in Him* unto holiness and salvation?—It is to make *this* prominent,—the equal validity of His prayer for all,—and not merely as bringing the future into the present, that the πιστευόντων is used;—for the πιστευσόντων of the Text. Rec. appears to be an unsupported correction.[1] As in Matt. xxviii. 20 and Mark xvi. 17 all that was commanded and forbidden to the Apostles is imposed at the

[1] Two isolated Codd. read πεπιστευκότων, which is error again—for the disciples of that time are not referred to, as distinguished from the Apostles.

close upon all future believers, so is it here with all things that are prayed for. That which was intimated by their being *sent* into the world, ver. 18, is now expressly stated—that *many* disciples would from age to age be won from the *world.* And these many are presently referred to with the strongest emphasis as *all!* And who can at any time reckon up their number, the multitudes of those who are concealed from the world and their fellow-disciples, and all down to the last whom faith shall save? In this intercessory prayer, the beginning and pledge of that intercession which still prevails on high, every one who believeth has his place. "If He thought of us when we were among the people who were yet to be formed for Him, how can He forget us now, when He sees us in the midst of the world, and beholds the struggle of our faith?" (Rieger.) If the first heirs of faith are sympathising *witnesses*—surely He, the Author and Finisher of the faith, to whom we look, looks down upon us as more than a mere witness. (Heb. xii. 1, 2.)

Faith itself is not prayed for or given; here as in ver. 8 it is the *condition* of the validity and effect of the intercession. The preachers who in their well-meaning zeal lay so much stress upon the grace of calling, election, and perseverance, should ponder well the language of Scripture itself, and beware of placing too absolutely in the hand, and gift, and purpose of God, the first decision also by which man becomes a believer![1]

[1] A. H. Francke, whose challenge of faith, and exhortation to it, is so good, yet says, "Thus did He pray to the Father for that faith which I now have!" Again, "I have to thank that same prayer that I have received His word, that I can now quicken and strengthen my faith through His word!" This is wrong even as it regards believers in *distinction* from the world; for a petition concerning *believing* occurs only in ver. 21, with a ἵνα for the whole world, which *might* believe if they would. The Apostle says in 2 Tim. iv. 7, not—The Lord gave me faith: comp. 1 Tim. i. 16. χάρισμα τοῦ θεοῦ is not πίστις, but ζωὴ αἰώνιος, the σωτηρία—and that παντὶ τῷ πιστεύοντι. Thus my position is incontrovertible, however much offence it may give, that faith itself, that is, our own decisive acceptance of the Divine influence and gift, is not in its subjective principle to be prayed for and given, but is demanded of us. Lange asks how this may be reconciled with Mark ix. 24; Lu. xvii. 5; and the answer is obvious. The former passage exhibits the πιστεύω of the man, elsewhere found wanting by our Lord, as a willingness on his own part: and in the other passage the Lord answers the πρόσθες of the Apostles by only εἰ εἴχετε.

All faith in all ages comes *through the word.* This, on the one hand, maintains the doctrine of prevenient grace, the grace of Him who calls, as universal for the world and as special for the individual, without which faith could not be spoken of at all: while, on the other hand, it recognises the freedom of our own decision, for *through the word* "means the free way of light and conviction." (As Braune well remarks, holding the right mean.) See Jno. xx. 31; Acts ii. 40, 41; Rom. x. 16, 17, and the entire Scripture. The word of the Father and of the Son before, is now *their* word:—the *αὐτῶν* depends immediately on the *τούτων*, and as in ver. 18 declares the Apostles to be the first medium of the *word of God* for all futurity, giving at the same time the reason why the Lord prayed specifically first for them, and in *their persons for all.* No man in after times should ever believe in Christ without the mediation of the testimony of these first witnesses; even Paul, to whom the Lord Himself appeared, was in secret prepared for his obedience to the heavenly vision, and was strengthened in his faith by the apostolical church which was in Christ before him. Nevertheless, true as this is —and too much emphasis cannot be laid upon it, against those who despise the apostolical doctrine under pretext of going straight back to the Lord Himself—it is also promised to *every* believer that others *through his word* should be brought to faith. "Thus the instrumental agencies, by which salvation is carried on, are sanctified. The word *tradition* is a good word in itself, when not perverted." (Berlenb. Bibel.)

Ver. 21. In the former passage the *first* unity of all, the future as well as the present disciples, was expressed as their equal *faith*, the sole distinguishing condition. It is this *unity* which must in its increase approve itself, and become a mighty *testimony* for believers who are to be won continually from the world. The *threefold ἵνα* exhibits a *development* in their connection:—even the second brings by *in us* the deeper consequence and fruit from the first unity in the received word, while the third plainly points to the end and fruit still contemplated. Four years before Lampe wrote, Vocula enim *ἵνα* non tam *argumentum* quam *scopum* precum indigitat, Francke had preached in Halle, "If it indicated the further *matter* of His prayer, it would have run thus: I pray—also for those—*that*

Thou wouldst give them, that they all may be one. But He is expressing the final object which He had in view in thus praying for His Apostles still—that He might bring all His own together in one." He then supplements His words thus: "But this does not exclude our regarding this as also the subject of our Lord's prayer. We may safely put the two together—both the *scopus precum* and the *argumentum precum*." With regard, however, to the third ἵνα, Lampe's "*not so much—as*" is of great importance; for in regard to the whole *world*, it is only the *design*, the aim that all who believe not might believe, which the ἵνα expresses.

What diversities are found among the members of the great body the church, in external relation to the world, as well as in vocation gifts, knowledge—and yet *all* are *one!* These two words most significantly meet here. This casts down the wall of partition between *Israel* (in this Prayer having no longer a distinctive place) and the Gentiles (Jno. xi. 52); as also all such distinctions as the ancient world recognised, according to Gal. iii. 28; Rom. i. 14. Similarly, by anticipation, all the distinctions which the modern world, and, alas, the Christian world itself, has set up. Here is the inmost principle of the *union* which seeks to find its external expression. The faith of the lowest and least is an *equally precious* faith with that of the Apostles, with that of Peter (2 Pet. i. 1)—there is a κοινωνία τῆς πίστεως, Phil. 6. The heartfelt faith of one who is theologically unformed and untaught, who knows nothing of dogmatic theology, must be recognised in its validity as ἰσότιμος by the most orthodox guides of faith. Distinctions and gradations there are, but unity may be secured and even illustrated in these. An enforced, external, deceptive unity is far from being the thing spoken of here; but the one word on which faith rests, the one end of the one way in the imitation of the one Lord and Shepherd, the one Spirit by whom all have access to one Father, make the essential unity of all who believe, and according to the proportion of their faith, know and live in believing. Not only among those who live near each other, and know themselves and their unity; but also among those who are distant from each other and unknown to each other, in all countries and through all times. The first fulfilment is found

in Acts iv. 32, as the prototype expression of the great *end.* For, as this ἵνα itself indicates, and the τετελειωμένοι in ver. 23, yet more strongly, "the unity is then first consummate when the sanctification becomes complete." (As Fikenscher excellently says, in words of comfort as well as exhortation.) First, always the *one heart and one soul*—then, on this foundation, and flowing from this, the exhortation to *speak the same thing, in the same mind and the same judgment* (1 Cor. i. 10), the growing up in the unity of love *into* the *unity of faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God,* Eph. iv. 13. Oh that our ecclesiastical bodies would hear and understand this!

"In their glasses men are brethren—when those are empty the union breaks up." (Braune.) This holds good of the intoxicating cup of vanity and delusion, over which men imagine a brotherhood of mankind independent of Christ—Pantheism, Communism, and the like. But where those *believers in Me* are, of whom Christ speaks, there *is* already unity, on the ground of which a further and more perfect unity *will* follow. This deepening advancement in the meaning is expressed by the *in us,*[1] introduced through the mediating clause *as Thou,* etc. Such interpretations as that of Grotius, *Sicut* nos conjunctis operis evangelium promovemus, and afterwards, ἐν ἡμῖν, *i.e.,* nobis obediendo! we will leave to the acceptance of the friends of false light. "The *being one* of believers is not only a being one after the *similitude* of the Father and the Son, but it is *bound up with* their being one; it is at the same time a being one *with* Father and Son, *since* God through Christ and His Spirit *essentially dwells in them.*[2] 1 Jno. i. 3." The *in us,* not merely *with us,* is now a deepening of the *as we,* ver. 11, and is to be understood according to Col. iii. 3. But not again (to quote Glassius), pro eâ, quam somniant Weigeliani et Stiefeliani, credentium ἀποθεώσει καὶ χριστουσίᾳ; or in the

[1] The ἐν once more added, though sometimes wanting in the MSS., is essential. The καὶ αὐτοί refers to the καθῶς, as Lücke remarks. But the second ἵνα is not, on that account, a mere resumption of the former.

[2] So Meyer, Bl. für höh. W. vii. 161. The Restitution consequently brings us abundantly more than man's original prerogative at the creation; although Mallet said well in his sermon, "Who can hear this petition from the heart and voice of Jesus—that they may be one, as we are—without thinking of the word, Let us make man, an image of Ourselves."

sense of the Pantheist all-God and humanity-Christ of our modern dreamers. "The infinite remains infinite; and the finite is still finite, even though it be *united* with the infinite nature of God"—this position of A. H. Francke we are taught by the *word*, from which the unity of faith proceeds, to apprehend; and our *adoration* in the blessedness of glory will one day seal to us its truth. But the word alone, which we receive, does not accomplish this; that does not in itself effect that union which here begins and there will be consummated, but the power and the Spirit of God in the word.

The third ἵνα must not be immediately connected with the ἐρωτῶ;[1] but the *world* is, nevertheless, in some sense the object of intercession—that they may *believe;* so that Wesley may say concisely, "Here Christ prays for the world!" He, however, proceeds with less exactness: "Observe the sum of His whole prayer, 1. Receive Me into Thy own and My glory; 2. Let My Apostles share therein; 3. And *all other believers;* 4. *And let all the world believe!*" For, as we have seen, we cannot suppose our Lord to pray directly (and with such a general "Let" as so often occurs in our prayers) for the faith of His disciples; any such *I pray that they may believe*, is, strictly speaking, quite inappropriate to our Lord's thought and the teaching of Scripture—if we take the ἵνα as the matter and argument of the prayer. Yet Wesley is perfectly right in the placing "the world" so strikingly after and over and above "all believers." But in this there seems to be a self-contradiction, which has not been much noticed, but which guides us to the solution of the mystery; for *if* in the previous πιστεύοντες all who were to believe are already included, there can remain only the permanently unbelieving world, according to the ordinary phrase. Thus it is not as Lampe says: "First, the Apostles; then the first Christians, the first-fruits of their word, the Apostolical Church; then the residue of the company to be brought from the Jews and Gentiles into the Church, down to the end of time." For these *saved out of the world* (as Came-

[1] This would mean, I pray for them, that *they all* may be one in faith—yea, that *this whole* world may believe. But against this view, that *all who were to be one* and *the world believing* are the *same subject*, Lampe justly protests.

rarius explains *the world* here) were already included under the *all* of the second *ἵνα*, but there is still remaining, over and above, the world, ver. 25. Still less admissible is Calvin's view (which even Lampe opposes): "*that the world may believe* in the third clause refers only to historical faith." For the Lord could not thus reduce the meaning of this great word, so sacred throughout the prayer; He never gives this meaning to *believing;* and certainly the miserable deception of an *unsaving historical faith* could not stand here as the object of Christ's desire. And is then "that the world *may know*" ver. 23 to be interpreted (as it has been) of an enforced acknowledgment, which is only the ground of condemnation? Oh no, the Lord could not thus either speak or pray; and in the apparent parallel, Rev. iii. 9 (according to Isa. xlv. 14, xlix. 23) they are a remnant, saved out of Satan's synagogue, who are to come and worship and see the love of the Lord to His Church. Nor is what Rieger says enough: "The world is regarded under the most favourable light, as the region out of which the future believers are received and collected into one." The petition would then be—I pray for all who shall believe on Me, that they may be one, *in order that*—those thus won from the world might believe! The bare repetition of *believing*, and of *world*, instead of *those who should be saved out of the world*, cannot possibly be received. Nothing therefore remains but the comparison with *that the world might be saved*, chap. iii. 17, and *that all might believe*, chap. i. 7. The intercession reaches its limit, where it recoils from unbelief and can find no fulfilment; for while we do find *was believed on in the world* (1 Tim. iii. 16), we never find *the world hath believed.* And this, nevertheless, is the simple meaning of the word; the Lord testifies now at the end *His own* desire and will that all the world might believe!

Still more: He suggests this aim of universal, all-seeking grace to *His Church;* and would teach His people to regard this as the goal, however unattainable in itself, of all the efforts of their united love—*ἵνα ὁ κόσμος πιστεύσῃ.* As St Paul, Rom. xi. 13, 14, contemplates a certain number gained from his own hardened Israel, as the last and most blessed fruit of his whole mission to the Gentiles—so should the entire believing Church never cease, when regarding the unbelieving world in its op-

position, to imitate the Apostle's spirit—*If by any means I may provoke to emulation them which are my flesh, and might save some of them.* And this is perfectly appropriate *to us*, since we draw no distinction between *some of them* and *the world: this* is what the Lord teaches us in the prayer which He permits us to listen to, wherein He includes in His petition even that which will not be fulfilled, just according to the *will* of the Divine counsel that all men might be saved, though all men are not. Thus "the Church should become an external Church" (as v. Gerlach says), that is, should exhibit the unity of its faith and of its love *before the world* and *for the world*, as an attracting and urgent witness; it should never cease, even in the strictest confederation of its living unity, to send forth the light and power of a universal mission, through that externality[1] of aim which is only the revelation of its internal truth and glory. That *unity* which alone gives power to its *missions*, and those *missions* which rest solely upon *unity*, are in their union the end of the Church. And this is also an intimation from above, that the greatest obstacle to the world's believing is the want of manifest unity in faith and love on the part of the imperfect Church. What condemnation, what admonition in these words of our Lord! Alas, alas, unbelief still hardens itself against the clearest testimony, ridicules the wonderful unity of love, and puts still its blasphemous construction upon the glory of Christ, beaming forth from His disciples; we however should not share its guilt, but always remember that our Lord Himself has put a strict connection between *that the world may believe* and our *being one.*

Vers. 22, 23. This might seem to be in part a repetition, but it is not so: for the unity now appears as the *glory* already given, and even already shining before the world; the establishment of this unity is placed forward as the end of perfection which we must reach to; and, finally, there is here a *knowledge* predicated of the world, corresponding to their *believing* before. *Καὶ ἐγώ*, standing at the beginning, depends on the previous *that thou hast sent Me:*—for the Saviour living in the Church, was to be contemplated in it as the Saviour of all men,

[1] Not, indeed, externalisation—see Petersen von der Kirche i. 85.

and especially of these only because they believed. Thus the καὶ ἐγώ is an explanatory *etenim.* And even because vers. 22, 23 are parallel with ver. 21, and an immediate development of it, those many tame interpretations of δόξα which have been devised are proved to be wholly out of the question.[1] Chrys. and Theophyl. took a step in advance; for they added to the working of miracles, and the wonderful teaching, the unity of love also, and the greater δόξα τῆς ὁμονοίας, thus embracing the whole furnishing of the Apostles. But, as the Apostles are no longer especially spoken of here, we regard the miraculous endowments and gifts of teaching as not taken into the account at all;—the *being one* is itself and alone the *glory.* This is already *given,* that is, not merely appointed to them,[2] not merely reserved and laid up (as the crown, 2 Tim. iv. 8), but as actually in its principle one and the same with that glory which was to be beheld in the future, and then fully enjoyed, ver. 24. That following verse is not to be distinguished from these, as containing a contrast; for throughout this prayer the Lord uses great words and ideas, fundamentally the same in meaning throughout; there is no more a twofold *glory* than a twofold *believing.* But their developments and aspects are different. Here, the *glory which Thou hast given Me* is that same glory of grace and truth, of love, of unity with the Father, which, according to Jno. i. 14, beamed forth to faith *from the humanity of Jesus;* and *this* He had truly given to His disciples upon earth already, because and so far as *He is in them.* Just as this δόξα of our Lord, *given* to His humanity, was distinguished in ver. 5, from that which He *had* eternally in the Godhead, but yet this distinction appeared only when it was to be abolished, and all is merged into one δόξα—even so must the unity and the distinction be understood here. Even the slightest glimmering of heavenly light which begins to shine out of the countenance of a justified publican, is an outbeaming of his future glorification; and so is the still brighter angel-face of the crowned martyr at his trial. Those who are risen again

[1] Grotius (like Ammonius and Zuinglius): The power of working miracles! For which he compares ch. ii. 11 and ch. xi. 40.

[2] B.-Crusius, incorrectly: "To give is here decidedly no other than to appoint." Gabler makes it at once "to promise."

with Christ in faith *are* already sitting with Him ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις. (Eph. ii. 6.) Those whom God hath justified He hath already glorified. (Rom. viii. 30.) Bengel's well-meant note is insufficient "already, *albeit hiddenly*," for the subject here is the *outbeaming* of this inwardly commencing, and already present glory, before the eyes of the world (however wilfully shut). And the Preacher has here a practical exposition of our Lord's word, which he should use without ceasing—Regard each other, at least, O believers, with respect! Learn, ye children of God, to stand in awe of your own dignity, that ye defile not yourselves with sin! Let your *thanksgivings* for what hath been already given invigorate your prayer and effort after holiness and perfection! (Col. i. 12; Eph. i. 18.)

And all this *through faith!* "A drop of faith is far more noble than a whole sea of mere science, though it be the historical science of the Divine word." (Francke.) "Every Christian must thus deeply sink himself into Christ by believing—this is everything. This decides his faith, this decides his works, his life, his graces. All this is in the words—*I in them and Thou in Me!*" (Gossner.) Again, as Rieger says of this heavenly ladder, standing upon earth but reaching to the throne of God, "We must not begin at the top, but look well that we seize rightly the first steps." First in the faith of the heart to love Jesus; in the Holy Ghost, under whose discipline we stand obedient, to be one with the whole living church; and of the unity of *knowledge*, and of its *expression* in symbol and dogma, it may then be said—"It will follow!" That is, always taking it for granted that the first unity of faith in *the word of truth* is present. For, where the foundation of Christ's prayer, ver. 6–8, is not laid, there can be no love, no unity, no glory resulting, but *odium hæreticorum*, schism between Zion here and Zion there, the old envy between Ephraim and Judah, stumbling-blocks and scorn. All through faith—thus, still further back, all *through the word*, in which we believe! *This*, indeed, being the honest acknowledgment of its authority, but nothing beside being the visible centre of the unity of the church.

Vers. 22, 23 contain the same threefold ἵνα which is found in ver. 21, in the same relation and progression; hence the *and* before the third of them may well be struck out. But it is here

more clearly developed and prominent, that the union with the Father and the Son, and thereby with one another, which had been given from the early beginning of faith as a *glory*—is, nevertheless, a glory which unfolds, progresses, and increases. This is plainly contained in *that they may be perfected into one*, the εἰς being as important as the τελειοῦσθαι; comp. 1 Jno. iv. 18. Concerning the individual it is *made perfect in love*, but here *made perfect into one through love*.

Our exposition of ver. 21 will have shown that these words cannot refer to an effectual knowledge of the love of God in Christ, to which the world is brought—even though it should be at the end of the Gospel kingdom, when the company of believers shall shine forth before the world holy and glorious. Otherwise it might follow that it would be necessary only to show the New Jerusalem at last to the damned, in order to attract them to the then acknowledged eternal love of God. We reject at once all those explanations of the relations of *believing and knowing*, which assume the *world* to be those to be saved out of the world.[1] It is, assuredly, the Lord's purpose to say, with additional emphasis, that the *world* (if as world it would and subjectively could) might not merely believe, convinced by the lustre of grace which does now and which will at last most fully, shine forth in the Church—but actually *altogether* like the believers (vers. 7, 8) *intelligently and experimentally* believe.[2] The revelation of *love* leads to *know-*

[1] Among them is Bengel, who says with his usual penetration: "With the *world* the first principles of *faith* precede the ulterior and fuller *knowledge:* with *believers* themselves—a full *faith* follows upon a solid *knowledge*."

[2] After all, we are thus constrained to differ in our interpretation from those who think the praying for something not granted, or the attestation of an *intention* to save the whole world, inconsistent in this prayer, and therefore lower the plain words to signify something which has taken place, is taking place, or will take place. So Schmieder, "they must in spite of themselves at last confess"—but is that *believing* and *knowing* in the full sense of those words? And Luthardt similarly concludes that the portion of mankind outside the church will be at last constrained to acknowledge the church, and be brought to obedience toward Christ and His cause. But where is this written? Does not all Scripture predict the contrary? Taking the *world*, that is, according to its meaning throughout this prayer, and the whole Gospel. This goes beyond a final generation of humanity into a final victorious kingdom upon earth.

ledge, as we already observed in connection with the first that *the world may know*, ch. xiv. 31, anticipating its application to the Church. And the present word of our Lord points back directly to ch. xiii. 35, and is to be interpreted by it. The world might have, and should have *seen* and *heard* what the glorified Christ poured out for the glorification of His followers. (Acts ii. 33.) But it seeth and heareth not—it seeth not *the Holy Ghost*, neither knoweth Him! (Ch. xiv. 17.) It will not learn and understand what the *love of God* in believers is!

The reading ἠγάπησα is not suitable to the connection, which leads everything back to the Father, from ver. 21 downward; and the καί, without a new ὅτι or ἐγώ, shows plainly that *Thou hast loved* hangs immediately on *Thou hast sent*. Finally, to refer αὐτούς to the world, is altogether out of the question; for the special love of the Father to His own, in whom He seeth Christ, is something very different from the universal love of compassion toward the world: but here the former is evidently spoken of. *This* will be manifested to the world (in vain), for its knowledge, *therein* to take knowledge of the love which *sent* the Son for all.[1]

Ver. 24. Hitherto it has been the already given *internal* glory of believers, beaming forth in ever fuller light and radiance—but now the final glance forward to the goal demands its *revelation*, through the perfect fellowship with Christ, in all its eternal glorification both of body and soul. They alone shall be partakers of *this* full glory, who have been previously (this side the grave or the other) τετελειωμένοι εἰς ἓν:—but these shall most assuredly! The Lord, when he reaches this point, elevates His tone, changes His petition into an authorised demand, and sets it before the hearers of His Prayer in the form of a strong *promise*. It is perfectly in vain to attempt to degrade this solitary and sublime θέλω by all kinds of observations upon it:[2]

[1] Where we find ἀπέστειλε, it *always* indicates universal grace.

[2] Thus Grotius compares the *supplicating* θέλω and θέλομεν, Mark vi. 25, x. 35—yea, even the *commanding* one, Matt. x. 38—without observing that in the case of Herod's daughter and the sons of Zebedee there is involved a certain challenge of prerogative and claim. So alas Bengel, "I desire,"—though the Gnomon improves upon this. So Tholuck took θέλω for ἐπιθυμῶ. B.-Crusius of course decrees, "Θέλω has no special emphasis, but is simply the expression of a *wish*." Certain it is that it does so occur, and Jno. xii.

the immediate feeling which the Holy Ghost, the true Expositor, puts into our hearts as its best interpretation, will be always its best defence. It is no other than a *testamentary word* of the Son, who in the unity of the Father is *appointing* what He wills, at that second limit of His prayer where its petitions cease. (Comp. *I appoint*, Lu. xxii. 29.) At the first limit, when confronting the unbelieving world, His petition sounds out in a *ἵνα*, the non-fulfilment of which He knows beforehand; but at the second limit, when His kept and perfected believers are in view, the petition takes the higher tone of a serene, majestic *I will!* (In the Heb. N. T. very properly חָפֵץ in contradistinction from שׁוֹאֵל.)

Whom Thou hast given to Me—is not (as Bengel thinks) a restriction to the *Apostles* once more, for this follows first in ver. 25 with *these; all* believers are referred to, as in ver. 20, and the δέδωκας is an anticipation, equally with the ἔδωκας as spoken of the glory. Assuredly, he who in his joyful faith knows himself to be given of the Father to Christ, can and will have in Christ through the Holy Spirit, or rather Christ in him will have, such an anticipating assurance of salvation and glory. Notwithstanding, since this springs from the will of Christ alone, and *our* will needs, down to the final probation of death, to urge its humble prayer, we would counsel no man to echo Christ's words—Father in Christ, *I will* to behold one day the glory of Thy Son![1] On the *where I am* see already ch. xii. 26. Our *love* teacheth us that to be *with Christ* would be in itself fully sufficient for blessedness; love desires, even in heaven, nothing beside Him for its unutterable joy:[2] but *faith* knoweth at the

21; 1 Cor. vii. 7, are better examples; but it is equally certain that there is strong emphasis in the word elsewhere (in the Lord's, Be it unto thee even as thou *wilt!*—and *e.g.* Jno. xv. 17)—and if anywhere thus emphatic, certainly it is *here*.

[1] Francke carries this too far. The child-like and simple "Father, I will," is something very different, but even that would be used by no experienced Christian even in his highest devotion. Even Luther's boldness of faith did not take the word so rigorously, "Touching all spiritual things we might even pray confidently, like Christ, Father, *I will!*" But could he use this "*I will*" in his own prayers constantly, and without repugnance?

[2] As the same *love* (in Francke's better words) here also speaks in Christ: —"I will and must have all My children with Me!"

same time that His crowned love will endow His own with an equal crown, and therefore scorns not the crown, the highest gift of the Highest Giver. This is the resolution of the contest between *disinterested love* and the *regard to reward.* With the supremest majesty Christ here speaks of *His own* glory and the *beholding* it, as the highest blessedness of His glorified ones; comp. Ex. xxxiii. 18. In "which Thou *hast given*" there does not lie, as Lücke says, "that relation of subordination, which can never be disengaged from the Johannæan doctrine of the Logos."[1] If we embrace the Divinity and the humanity in one Person, speaking after both relations, everything becomes consistent. The humanity says ἔδωκάς μοι concerning the same *glory* which the Divinity at the same time calls τὴν ἐμήν; just as in ver. 5 the *glorify Me* and the *which I had* are similarly related.

He does not, however, say "*My* glory" otherwise than as He appoints it to be shared by *us.* *Behold* is an experiencing and tasting (as ch. viii. 51), for according to ver. 22 the Lord had *given* to us already His glory. When we see Him as He is (it cannot be otherwise, hence the Apostle derives from this his expression, 1 Jno. iii. 2) then shall we behold ourselves also as His co-heirs, receive the manifestation of that which we are and have become, and that without obscuration through a *body of humiliation,* or the *tribulation of the world.* Then, not till then, shall we perfectly understand and enter into the fruition of this prayer. But that all who believe on Christ shall attain to this, to be co-heirs of the glory of Christ, was fore-arranged and fixed in the *eternal counsel of love* between the Father and the Son. *For* Thou lovedst Me before the foundation of the world! Thus does the Lord, after ver. 5, speak a second time, and takes His own with Him into the same *love,* and consequently into the same glory,—by this *I will* corresponding to the will of the Father. Here we have a better answer to the question, "what was God doing before He created the world?" than that well-known one which Luther gave—"Preparing rods for those who should ask Him such questions!" The answer to the inquiry of *faith,* as humble as it is bold, is here given—He *loved* the

[1] It might have been thought that *the Word was God* would have been sufficient, at the very beginning of his gospel.

Son, and, beholding them by anticipation in the Son, He loved His people redeemed from among sinners, redeemed through the glorious accomplishment of the ways of God in the creature.

Ver. 25. And now before the close—we might say, in an accommodated sense, "that all righteousness might be fulfilled" —comes the other side of the question, the complementary reference to the *world*, and how the matter goes with *it*. Not, however, the other part of the world, that which will remain in unbelief, after those who had come to knowledge and salvation are gathered out; this we have amply refuted already, and once more refute it by observing that now in ver. 25 the world remains, as in chap. xii. 47, 48, xvi. 33, xviii. 36, comp. 1 John v. 19. But now follows an explanation of the meaning and significance which alone such expressions as *that the world may be saved, may believe, may know*, can have as used by the Lord in solemn earnestness of truth and under the inmost pressure of all-embracing love. He thus also *distinguishes* once more at the conclusion of His prayer between the world and His own; and it certainly refers to the final decision, penetrating into eternity just as does the glorification of His own. He cannot close with "and I *in all*," or even "and I in the world"—only "*in them*."

Having reached this point He appeals appropriately to the "*righteous* Father:" this being the only instance, even as the "*holy* Father" was before! They are by no means identical; for the assertion that ἅγιος and δίκαιος are one and the same in St John springs only from a misunderstanding of the true meaning of the former.[1] First, it is plain that the Lord testifies, acknowledges, addresses the *rightecusness* also of the Father, because that essentially belongs—though not as a punitive justice so much as righteousness to be acknowledged, as effectually condemning and abolishing sin—to the work of *redemption* and *atonement*. And this expression of the Redeemer, now going to His death, remains a firm *dictum probans*, pointing to the reason why thus and thus only He must sanctify Himself for those who are to be sanctified.[2] Let him who would take

[1] As Neander understands and translates it.

[2] Lange speaks of Christ's presentiment that He must now experience the full severity of the righteousness of God, even as He knew it in His Spirit.

away from the offering for sin all reference to the Father's righteousness, that a vainly imagined love alone might remain, humble his ignorance to hear this word of the Son Himself—*Righteous* Father, *I know Thee!* And in Thy righteousness! That righteousness which *spareth not* Me! But this is not enough; nor is it the fundamental sense of the word, as preceding the subsequent words—it is rather something included and presupposed. For the consecration of Christ to death for the sanctification of sinners, the δίκαιος was already involved and merged in the ἅγιος; and ch. xvi. 10 taught that the communication of the righteousness of Christ to believers was at the same time itself righteousness before God. Thus the further and especial reference of the *righteous Father* lies in the separation between believers and the world, in the *judgment* which will follow even after a universal redemption. "He appeals, finally, to the holy righteousness of the Father, in regard to the issue of the great hour of conflict impending between Himself and the world which knew not God." So says Lücke, feeling after but not quite finding the truth; for this concluding part of the prayer does not *merely* refer to the coming hour of conflict, nor merely to the decision between *Him* and the world;—for His disciples stand with Him in opposition to it. C. H. Rieger writes better, though rather hinting than unfolding the truth, concerning this "final testimony" (as Schmieder terms it): "These final words contain no longer any express petitions; they rather seal with an Amen all that precedes. The beloved Son of God *gives over all things*, which He had contemplated on His own behalf, on behalf of His disciples, and all other believers (we would add,—on behalf of the world's believing), *to the righteousness* of His heavenly Father, and thus testifies His confidence that the *Righteous Father will do all things well with regard to all these.*" It is the unfolding which is wanted here: He will do all things *justly* and well—in regard to His Son's sufferings, the condemnation of the unbelieving world, the blessedness of believers—in regard to these three, for His righteousness' sake! This last testimony is a confession, an acknowledgment before God, a ὁμολογία and ὁμολόγησις before the Father, just like that preliminary and prophetic one, Matt. xi. 25. Luther makes one aspect of it prominent in words which are too rough

for the gentle love of Christ, but true enough in themselves: "Thou doest right in letting *them* (who know not Thee and Me) go in their obdurate blindness to their father the devil; so that *they* must not behold anything of My glory either in the word and knowledge of faith, or in future direct contemplation." Christ *cannot* say, or ask, or will—Righteous Father, let also the unsanctified behold My glory, let sinners in their sin come to the bliss of heaven! Let those who have not known Thee and Me have, notwithstanding, eternal life!! (Mark the glance back to ver. 3 in this σὲ οὐκ ἔγνω.) The other aspect is thus expressed by Grotius: "inasmuch as it becomes the Father's *equity*, that those should be rewarded who have renounced the world, and worshipped Him." And it is true that the Scripture admits from the beginning such a benign צְדָקָה toward the just, acknowledging, saving, and blessing them, in contradistinction to the evil; although צַדִּיק is never of itself and as such *benevolent*, yet benevolence itself is strictly connected with relative righteousness. God is not unrighteous, that He should not respond to the faith and love of those who apprehend His grace. (Heb. vi. 10.) For "it would be to His holy grace an unrighteousness, if He did not respond with all His faithfulness both as God and Creator, to every approach of His creatures"—as we have said elsewhere upon this passage. But it would be onesided, to regard this alone as signified here. Olshausen combines both, holding fast the connection of this *righteous Father* even with ver. 24 (out of which it immediately arose!): "For the Son appeals, for the granting of this prayer, to the righteousness of the Father,[1] who both excludes the God-estranged world from beholding His glory, and brings all believers filled with God to that great consummation." See 2 Thess. i. 4–10, according to which it is a *righteous thing with God* to recompense tribulation to some, rest to others—*vengeance on those who know not God*, but glory to His holy believers. *Compare, once more, the* ἐκδίκησις of Lu. xviii. 7.[2] God remains *righteous* even in the redemption which justifies sinners, and makes them holy: partly, inasmuch as He has set forth the

[1] Still better, *Grounds* His θέλω upon this, that He himself knoweth and beareth in Himself the eternal counsel of the righteous Father.

[2] And what we said upon it, Vol. iv.

ἱλαστήριον for faith, in the blood of Jesus (Rom. iii. 26); and partly, because He disciplines even believers, in the fellowship of the מוּסַר שָׁלוֹם, with the sanctifying correction of grace, cleansing them from their sins that they may become worthy of His kingdom, 2 Thess. i. 5. "Nothing is more wholesome and refreshing for every one of us, nothing more effectually secures the peace of the soul, than to say after the Saviour—Righteous Father! that is, when he can accept all—the death of his flesh, the life of his spirit, the destruction of his sin, the service of the living God, the loss of his portion in this life, with the corresponding heirship of God, and co-heirship with Christ—as grounded in the righteousness of the Father." So Rieger once more; and we would only add—When he can also, like Christ in this last word of solace, accept it as right that its part in the tree of life and the holy city should be *taken away from the* world.

But how is the immediately following καί[1] to be construed and understood? Lampe regarded it as *although*, Tholuck similarly for καίτοιγε (though this does not hold good of ch. iii. 13); but Winer protests, connecting it thus with what precedes: "Righteous Father, and (yet), *although Thou hast been so compassionate toward men*, the world knoweth Thee not![2] Thus, nevertheless, after all I must now say—!" This might be accepted, as Grotius puts it, Cohæret sententia cum præcedentibus ὅτι ἠγάπησας—itaque *non est interdisstinquendum* complete post κόσμου. But when we punctuate it thus (as Lachm. does) the inappropriateness of such a connection *with what precedes* becomes manifest. Certainly, the pregnant invocation *Righteous Father* cannot possibly be a mere parenthesis; this new and most impressive epithet indicates an altogether new topic, and the καί must be construed *with what follows*. There is a contrast in the twofold καί (the subsequent δέ being put for καί), here as often elsewhere; and the entire clause runs just as if the words were

[1] Which, though wanting in many Codd. and in the Vulg., we regard with Lücke as genuine, even on account of its difficulty.

[2] Better, at least, than Meyer's strange reference to the καταβολὴ κόσμου previously (which is an entirely different idea):—*Even this* world knoweth thee not. In the Lord's own language, ἑβραϊστί (Jno. xx. 16) it is probable the two ideas would be distinguished by two different words.

ὅ τε κόσμος—ἐγώ δέ. Then comes out distinctly the distinction and separation to which the *Righteous* emphatically refers.

In the form *hath not known Thee* instead of *knoweth Thee not*, the Lord thinks of the *then present* world (as of the then present disciples), of *the* world to which, equally with the disciples, He had preached and borne His witness; and to whose persistent hatred of God He was now in act to surrender Himself a victim. The world will, before the righteous Father, persist in its unrighteousness and sin, will rush to its destruction! The *not knowing* is its own proper guilt, on account of which God can manifest Himself to it as only just; nor must we invert the sense, after the predestinarian manner of Augustin: Propterea itaque mundus te non cognovit, *quia* justus es et meritis ejus, *ut non cognosceret, tribuisti.* For although this were established by Matt. xi. 25, 26, to be a possible interpretation, yet *here* after *that the world may know* in ver. 23, such cannot be the meaning. The mournful fact alone is here stated, and, given up to its righteous punishment—*The world hath not known Thee*, comp. ch. xv. 21, xvi. 3. But this first fact, which the Lord must bring with His atoning sacrifice before the righteous Father, continues from age to age, as the farewell discourses predict. Hence it is not—But one day this world must and will acknowledge Thee; nor—The time is coming when there will be no "world left," but *I in all;* or anything similar. Ah no, the fruitless ἵνα of compassionate love which looked for a faith and acknowledgment on the part of the world, is followed now by the protest—But the world will still remain the world! That the positive, actual *hath not known* is not turned into an express future, is to be explained by the sorrow of compassion which, here as in ver. 12, is not wanting to this prayer of joy; and, further, by the considerate love which would utter no word that might be perverted into a fore-dooming of the world to ruin. This *High-priestly* prayer reveals to us only the intercession of Him who still beareth the sin of men, leaving them space of repentance and opportunity of being blessed; and not yet the first and final curse of the Kingly Judge—though the curse which hovers over the head of the unbelieving is warningly announced from afar.

The world, even the Christian world *knoweth not* the right-

eous Father, even to this day, knoweth not the Son who revealeth Him—although naming and calling upon both, like the Jews with their God and their Messiah. The Lord looks out upon not merely the Jewish world, but also upon the darkness of the Gentiles upon earth, when He opposes to this the sublime word —*But I* know Thee! We have not a single word to add to its sublimity; but would humbly observe in what sense the Lord graciously unites with Himself His own. *And these*—refers *now*, returning to the present, especially to the Apostles who surround Him. The substance even of *their* knowledge is embraced in the same *That Thou hast sent Me*, which in ver. 23 was spoken concerning the *knowledge* of the world;—and this is a supplementary proof that it was not an enforced acknowledgment merely that was there intended, and similarly proves, that in ver. 3 the knowledge of Him who was sent is just itself the knowledge *of God.* They knew Me as sent of Thee and as Thy Son (as Christ, the Son of the living God), and thus through Me and in Me *Thyself also* as My Father, holy and righteous—and this they know with Me, in opposition to the world from which they are saved, *mundo relicto*, as Grotius said. All this lies in the simple expression, so that ver. 26, with its *I have declared to them*, connects itself with this, and is its continuation.

Ver. 26. *Righteous*—and yet *Father*, in Himself eternal *love* before the foundation of the world, and then in the fulness of time revealed as *redeeming love* through the *sending* of the *Son* into the world—*Thus have the disciples known Him!* Thus the righteous Father is in His righteousness holy, as in His holiness righteous; as the righteous Father He *loveth* through Christ all penitent believing, and thus sanctified, sinners. Yea, *as* He loveth Christ He loveth us, for He giveth Him up for us all. Therefore now, after all that has been said, the *ἐγνώρισα τὸ ὄνομά σου*, is stronger than *ἐφανέρωσα*, ver. 6—compare the *γνωρίζειν πάντα*, ch. xv. 15. In the name known, in the disclosed nature of the Father consists the *truth*, which had been spoken of before;[1] and because the disciples were not yet fully sanctified in this truth, it follows now—*And will declare it*

[1] We may well call it the perfection of all knowledge of God, to be able to utter, to pray, to confess before God, with full understanding, these two words in their unity, "Righteous—Father!"

yet more fully. This is the last great promise, in which at the same time the Son attributes to Himself what He had prayed for before as from the Father; for it is as much as if He had said—I will sanctify them in Thy truth. That which is promised in Ps. xxii. 23 proceeds in its accomplishment, until the brethren of the First-begotten are all made perfect. Assuredly, it is included here that this declaring of the name should be vouchsafed to all who were to be called in the future;[1] therefore there is no *to them* following *I will declare*, but rather in the last *in them* the latter and the former are merged into one, as vers. 20–24. Grotius remarks on *I will declare*—"still more in colloquies after the resurrection;" Bengel refers to Jno. xx. 17; but all this is far from enough. This making known as resulting in a true, growing, and perfect knowledge, takes place *through the Holy Ghost*, according to ch. xvi. 13–15; and goes on *in the Church.* (Ps. xxii. 23, בְּתוֹךְ קָהָל, in the midst of the Church, comp. Heb. ii. 12.) And it is to be noted that, through the Spirit, the Church of Christ is truly led to the knowledge of the *Father.*

But, finally, all knowledge through the word in the Spirit is living knowledge, the *living* in the *love* of God; this therefore must now follow with a final *ἵνα.* The Accus. *ἣν* is stronger than *ᾗ* would be, points to that love with which the Father hath loved the Son from all eternity as being *love* absolutely, without measure; nevertheless, this same love of God is presently shared with believers, as implanted in them, for the Son loveth His own with the same love with which the Father loveth Him, and grounds upon that His evangelical precept—Continue ye in My (and the Father's) love, ch. xv. 9, 10. As it was there, so it is here, intended: *Love is in them*—as the love of God to them, their love to God, and their mutual love among themselves. To omit either of these three references is to qualify the full meaning of the passage. *Love* (not faith, not eternal life, not glory)—only *love* is the last word here: let every one ponder this and feel it! "With this end of creation, redemption, and sanctification, the Redeemer closes His High-priestly prayer. Love created the world, love took compassion

[1] B.-Crusius: *I have declared and will declare*, thus the Present and the Future.

upon the sinful world, love will unite in one the sanctified. Love is the eternal essence of God, and the principle of all His dealings." (Fikenscher.) The indwelling of His love is not simply "the *practical* end" of the knowledge of the name and nature of God, as it is very generally distinguished; but *the love being in them* is itself the living, consummate *knowledge*, even as it is the glorifying *unity* and *glory*. (Gal. iv. 9; 1 Cor. viii. 3; Eph. iii. 18, 19; 1 John iv. 7–16.) But the love of the Father dwelleth in us only through the mediation of the Son; we know and we have the Father only as the Father of Christ, nor shall we possess Him throughout eternity otherwise: —thus the *last word of all* after the last is, I IN THEM! Let this conclusion, also, be well pondered and felt! The Lord does not conclude by saying—And Thou in them![1] Let ver. 23 be carefully compared. Finally, Christ in us, the love of the Father in us—is no other in its truth and power than the *communion of the Holy Ghost*, who bringeth through the grace of Christ the love of God to man:—this therefore approves itself as the final aim and end of this petition.

Such a conclusion is a more sublime seal than any Doxology, than any Amen of other supplication—which indeed could find no place here. That all things which He prays for and promises may be Yea and Amen,—the Lord of glory went, after these words, over the brook Cedron, to the woe of Gethsemane, to the death of the Cross, and, through the death endured for our sins, to His holy and righteous Father. This death is the centre of all that grace and truth of which the word bears witness to faith; out of this death cometh life, and love, and sanctification, and unity, and eternal glory.

[1] As if that should be fulfilled even in eternity which Fichte referred to the present time: "When Christ hath brought men to God, He Himself, in His person and name, as the way and the guide, will be forgotten!" Not only His *name*, but His *person* as mediating, abideth; the mysterious word of 1 Cor. xv. 24 is certainly not to be understood as if the power of Christ, the Abolisher, was to be abolished.

END OF VOLUME SIXTH.

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA.

THIS BOOK IS DUE ON THE LAST DATE
STAMPED BELOW

AN INITIAL FINE OF 25 CENTS
WILL BE ASSESSED FOR FAILURE TO RETURN
THIS BOOK ON THE DATE DUE. THE PENALTY
WILL INCREASE TO 50 CENTS ON THE FOURTH
DAY AND TO $1.00 ON THE SEVENTH DAY
OVERDUE.

FEB 11 1941 M

1 Apr'50 CA

LD 21-100m-7,'39 (402s)

YD 1080

BS2370
S8
v. 5-6

57095

Luke